

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



A schism and its aftermath : an historical analysis of denominational discription in the Elim Pentecostal Church, 1939-1940.

Hudson, David Neil

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to:

- Share: to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

A Schism And Its Aftermath.

An historical analysis of

denominational discription in the

Elim Pentecostal Church, 1939-1940.

A Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

David Neil Hudson

King's College, London

1999



ABSTRACT

In 1940, George Jeffreys (1889-1962), the founder of the Elim Pentecostal Churches, resigned after policy decisions he had desired to introduce into the Movement were rejected by the ministers within the denomination. He then instituted a rival denomination. George Jeffreys had been the supreme charismatic leader within Elim for 25 years. This situation, where a founder of a denomination resigns and then forms an opposing movement, is unique within Pentecostalism.

The thesis examines the discession of the Elim Pentecostal Church that climaxed in 1940, with the second, and final, resignation of George Jeffreys.

The thesis is divided into three major sections. The first examines the implicit reasons for the discession. These factors include Jeffreys' individualism, his evangelistic success and his relationships. This will be the first time that such an analysis has been presented. The second section highlights the explicit reasons for the split. This major part of the thesis concentrates on the situation in the Irish churches, the significance of British Israelism, the formation of Jeffreys' independent evangelistic organisation, arguments concerning the financial health of the Movement, and ecclesiology. The final section deals with the survival of the Movement after Jeffreys' departure.

ABSTRACT

In 1940, George Jeffreys (1889-1962), the founder of the Elim Pentecostal Churches, resigned after policy decisions he had desired to introduce into the Movement were rejected by the ministers within the denomination. He then instituted a rival denomination. George Jeffreys had been the supreme charismatic leader within Elim for 25 years. This situation, where a founder of a denomination resigns and then forms an opposing movement, is unique within Pentecostalism.

The thesis examines the discription of the Elim Pentecostal Church that climaxed in 1940, with the second, and final, resignation of George Jeffreys.

The thesis is divided into three major sections. The first examines the implicit reasons for the discription. These factors include Jeffreys' individualism, his evangelistic success and his relationships. This will be the first time that such an analysis has been presented. The second section highlights the explicit reasons for the split. This major part of the thesis concentrates on the situation in the Irish churches, the significance of British Israelism, the formation of Jeffreys' independent evangelistic organisation, arguments concerning the financial health of the Movement, and ecclesiology. The final section deals with the survival of the Movement after Jeffreys' departure.

The main contribution that this thesis makes to scholarship is the full account it provides for the division in the Movement based on almost exclusive use of primary sources. As will be seen, very little has been written about the Elim Pentecostal Church. However, even that which has been produced has, on the whole, been either fiercely partisan or has not interacted with primary sources sufficiently. This thesis exists as a corrective to some of the existing works, but more particularly as a full record of the materials that have not previously been made public.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

At times, this work became a glorious obsession. I need to acknowledge my debt to those who encouraged me to pursue it.

My supervisor was Dr Andrew Walker. His initial enthusiasm was sustained throughout the whole project and gave me continued confidence that the project was not only possible, but worthwhile.

I was privileged to spend time with many of the pioneers of Elim, some of them shortly before they died. I am grateful for their time and interest, and inspired by their rugged determination that enabled the Movement to survive and develop into all that it is today.

When I began this work, I was the full-time minister of the Salford Elim Church. They gave me the time to begin this work and continued to share their love and concern for me through to its completion. I am now part of the teaching team at Regents Theological College, Nantwich. My colleagues' interest was always appreciated. In particular, I need to thank Keith Warrington who sharpened the focus of the thesis just at the right time.

To my parents who enabled me to begin the whole process I would want to express my love and gratitude.

Finally, to Maggie, who first encouraged me to investigate the possibilities and then continued to encourage me when it would have been easier to leave it alone, I owe a debt that is hard to express.

To Beth and Joel, they never could understand why I spent so much time on something so old!! One day I hope you will understand.

Deo gloria.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

1. Rationale for the thesis	11
2. The methodology of this thesis	14
3. The Elim Pentecostal Church	17
4. A brief historical survey: 1915-1950	18
5. The contemporary church government of Elim	19

2. Review of Literature 23

Noel Brookes: <u>Fight for the Faith and Freedom</u>	24
--	----

Albert W. Edsor: <u>George Jeffreys: Man of God</u>	26
---	----

In Defence of a Man of God Falsely Portrayed

'Set your House in Order'. God's Call to George Jeffreys
as the founder of the Elim Pentecostal Churches

Bryan Wilson: <u>Sects and Society: The sociology of three religious groups in Britain</u>	29
--	----

Walter Hollenweger: <u>The Pentecostals</u>	33
---	----

Desmond Cartwright: <u>The Great Evangelists</u>	35
--	----

Donald Gee: <u>Wind and Flame</u>	37
-----------------------------------	----

Gordon Atter: <u>The Third Force</u>	38
--------------------------------------	----

John T. Nichol: <u>The Pentecostals</u>	39
---	----

Andrew Walker: <u>Restoring the Kingdom</u>	39
---	----

<u>Part One: Implicit Reasons for the Split</u>	41
1 The Welsh Revival	43
1. A comparison between Jeffreys' and Phillips' social backgrounds and conversion experiences	44
2. The impact of the Welsh Revival on Jeffreys	45
3. Jeffreys' understanding of revival	47
4. Jeffreys' desire to control spontaneity	52
5. Conclusion	60
2 Divergent views concerning the person and work of the Holy Spirit	62
1. The significance of the Keswick Convention to early Pentecostals	62
2. Jeffreys' experience of the Holy Spirit	65
3. The Spirit's work in regeneration	71
4. The relationship between sanctification and the reception of the Holy Spirit	76
5. The sign of being filled with the Spirit	79
6. Conclusion	85
3 An analysis of Jeffreys' evangelistic success	88
1. Jeffreys' perception of his own ministry	90
2. The perception that Jeffreys had of his standing with the laity within Elim	93
3. Popular explanations for Jeffreys' success	97
4. Jeffreys' self-preservation as a reason for Jeffreys' success	101
5. Social reasons for Jeffreys' success	106

5.1 The reaction to the popularity of cinema - an example of rejecting the world	107
5.2 Adapting the 'world' to Elim's cause	109
5.3 The social context of Jeffreys' ministry	115
5.4 Jeffreys in the context of a revivalist age	119
6. Conclusion	122
4 George Jeffreys' relationships	124
1. His relationship with his brother, Stephen	125
2. Jeffreys and the Revival Party	131
3. Jeffreys' relationship with E.J. Phillips	135
3.1 A brief biographical sketch of Phillips	136
3.2 Similarities with Jeffries	140
3.3 Phillips' view of George Jeffreys	146
3.4 An uneasy reconciliation	149
4. Conclusion	151
Part One: Summary and Conclusion	154
<u>Part Two: Explicit Reasons for the Schism</u>	157
1 The Irish Situation	158
1. The Irish socio-political background	158
2. The birth and growth of the Elim churches	160
3. The Irish churches post-1920	163
4. The opportunity provided by the Portadown Elim church	167
5. 1935: The return to familiar themes	174

6. Conclusion	178
2 British Israelism	180
1. A brief history of British Israelism	180
2. George Jeffreys' beliefs regarding the Anglo-Israel identification	185
3. Reasons for acceptance of the identification	197
4. John Leech and the development of Elim	200
5. The British Israel debate at Conference	202
6. Conclusion	212
3 The World Revival Crusade	214
1. Precursors of the World Revival Crusade	214
2. The World Revival Crusade and Jeffreys	215
3. The World Revival Crusade and the Executive Council	218
4. Conclusion	224
4 The Financial Situation, 1936-37	226
Conclusion: Was there a financial crisis?	236
5 Church government and the split: 1936-1940	239
1. The background to Jeffreys' developing belief in the local government of churches	240
2. The desire to change his role	245
3. 1937: 'Set your house in order'	249
4. The Conference of 1938	251
5. 1939: Approaching the inevitable	256
6. The Conference of 1939	262

6.1	Preparing for the Conference	262
6.2	The Conference: 20 November-1 December 1939	264
6.3	The aftermath of the 1939 Conference	272
7.	The final break	277
7.1	Events prior to the second resignation	277
7.2	The 1940 Conference. May 20-25: The final break	283
8.	Conclusion	288
Part Two: Summary and Conclusion		290
<u>Part Three: The Aftermath of the Schism</u>		293
1.	Making theological sense of the split	293
1.1	The split as divine conflict	293
1.2	The split as a result of defects in Jeffreys' personality	295
1.3	The split resulting from God's intervention	296
1.4	The impact that Jeffreys' supporters had on the split	297
2.	The fight for the churches	298
3.	The disciplining of ministers	302
4.	Retaining property by force	303
5.	Attempts to appeal to Pattern ministers	306
6.	Attempts to re-evaluate Jeffreys' contribution	308
7.	Facing the reality of the situation within Elim	310
7.1	Attention drawn to the need for evangelism	313
8.	The 1944 Conference	315
9.	The role of P.S. Brewster	318

10. Failed attempts at mediation	324
Part Three: Summary and Conclusion	327
<u>Final Summary and Conclusion</u>	328
Appendices	335
Bibliography	346

1. Introduction

1. Rationale for the thesis

In 1940, George Jeffreys (1889-1962), the founder of the Elim Pentecostal Churches, resigned after policy decisions he had desired to introduce into the Movement were rejected by the ministers within the denomination. He then instituted a rival denomination. George Jeffreys had been the supreme charismatic leader within Elim for 25 years and to many his departure was deemed to be the death-blow for the denomination. This situation, where a founder of a denomination resigns and then forms an opposing movement, is unique within Pentecostalism. Even the doyen of Pentecostal historiography, Walter Hollenweger, whilst recognising that marginalisation of charismatic leaders is common, cannot produce another situation that parallels the one between Jeffreys and Elim.¹

The thesis examines the discription of the Elim Pentecostal Church that climaxed in 1940, with the second and final, resignation of George Jeffreys from the denomination that he had inaugurated. The thesis examines all the factors that were involved in this fissure between the founder, George Jeffreys and the Secretary General, Ernest John Phillips (1893-1973),² the de facto leader of Elim's leadership, the Executive Council. The thesis also highlights the reasons for the survival of the denomination. It will be argued that the seeds of the break between Jeffreys and Phillips were in evidence long before

¹ Letter, W. Hollenweger to author, 10 November 1997.

² This division has always been referred to in Elim as 'the split'. I have followed the same nomenclature in this paper.

1940. From 1933, it was clear that the relationship between Jeffreys and Elim was heading along a course that would lead to breakdown.

The breakdown between Elim's two principal architects is the result of various factors. Therefore, after an assessment of the literature dealing with the Elim Pentecostal Church, the thesis will be divided into three sections.

The first section examines the implicit reasons for the split. It will be shown that from an early age, Jeffreys was deemed to be special, marked out for God's service. Indeed, this was his own assessment of his life. Jeffreys' Christian experiences encouraged him to stand for principles and theological positions that few others believed to be tenable. This tenacity illustrated the assurance he had in his own ability to correctly interpret scripture and, more generally, the will of God that became increasingly manifest in the years 1933-40. Included in this first section will be an analysis of Jeffreys' evangelistic success between the years 1920-1934. This section is relevant to the overall thesis since Jeffreys believed that his evangelistic success vindicated his proposed church reforms. Therefore, Jeffreys' estimation of his own ministry and the perception of the ministers within the Elim denomination will be examined against the culture of the day. It will be suggested that there were various specific reasons for Jeffreys' overwhelming evangelistic appeal and that Jeffreys was mistaken to believe that his esteem as an evangelist would result in his church reforms being accepted. The personalities of Jeffreys and Phillips will also be examined in an attempt to explain their subsequent

actions.³ This will be the first time that such an analysis has been presented. In particular, the aspects of Philips' character that refused to allow Jeffreys to deconstruct the Elim Movement will be highlighted.⁴

The second section will highlight the explicit reasons for the split. This major part of the thesis will concentrate on the development of the specific factors that contributed to the eventual schism. These factors involved the situation in the Irish churches, differences of opinion regarding the significance of British Israelism, the formation of Jeffreys' evangelistic organisation - the World Revival Crusade, arguments concerning the financial health of the Movement, and ecclesiology.

The final section deals with the survival of the Movement after Jeffreys' departure. The possibility of Elim surviving the loss of Jeffreys was not viewed as inevitable by the ministers at the time. The various actions that were taken so that Elim could survive have been examined.

The main contribution that this thesis makes to scholarship is the full account it provides for the division in the Movement based on almost exclusive use of primary sources. As will be seen, very little has been written about the Elim Pentecostal Church. However, even that which has been produced has, on the whole, been either fiercely partisan or has not interacted with primary sources

³ A full biography is still required on Jeffreys, in particular, one that would be able to do full justice to his relationship with Phillips and the whole Elim Movement.

⁴ Ministers and members of the Elim Pentecostal Church have generally referred to their denomination as the "Movement". This term has been used throughout the thesis.

sufficiently. This thesis exists as a corrective to some of the existing works, but more particularly as a full record of the materials that have not previously been made public.

2. The methodology of this thesis

The main sources of information used in this thesis came from letters written between Jeffreys and Phillips, and Phillips and W.G. Hathaway between 1925-40.⁵ Due to the efficiency of Elim Headquarters during this period, practically every piece of their correspondence was retained. These letters were often written on a daily basis and all the discussions pertaining to the split appeared in these letters before they were rehearsed elsewhere. The letters between Jeffreys and Phillips were not simply the reflections of individuals; they were regarded as being the correspondence between Jeffreys and the whole of the Executive Council. Writing in 1937, Phillips explained,

I sincerely trust that it is clearly understood that the present correspondence is from the Executive Council and myself, and not merely between us as two members of the Executive.⁶

Other letters examined have been those written by Jeffreys, Phillips and Hathaway to Executive Council members and ministers of local churches.

These letters were often debated between Phillips and Jeffreys before they were sent. Therefore, they have been read against the background of any prior debate that may have occurred.

⁵ W.G. Hathaway was the Field Superintendent for most of the period 1926 to 1950. The Field Superintendent oversaw the activities of ministers and churches.

⁶ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 19 February 1937.

Another source of information has been the minutes of the Ministerial Conferences from 1932-39 and the Representative Conferences from 1940 onwards.⁷ Whilst the minutes do not give details of discussions, they remain significant because of the resolutions that were passed. Phillips' unpublished notes of speeches presented to the Conferences were preserved and have proved invaluable in providing an impression of the passion that the issues provoked.⁸

The Elim Evangel was a significant resource.⁹ Naturally this contained censored information, since it was the official publication of the Movement, although that makes the material more significant, since it is propaganda that has been decided should be read by the church membership. In addition, from 1939 onwards, a flood of pamphlets and open letters were circulated amongst the Executive Council, the ministers, diaconates and churches. These are quite repetitive in their claims and counter-claims. However, they have been used to explain events after the second resignation of Jeffreys in November 1940.

Finally, information was received through correspondence and interviews with ministers who had served in Elim throughout the period of the split. I was aware of the potential dangers of relying on memories distanced from the

⁷ The Representative Conference includes ministers and laity. This was a change that resulted from Jeffreys' pressure to change the organisation of the Movement.

⁸ These notes were taken by the official stenographer, Mabel Dalton.

⁹ This was published monthly from December 1919 until December 1925, fortnightly from 1926-1928, and weekly thereafter until 27 May 1989, when publication ceased. The Elim Evangel was replaced by the monthly publication, Direction.

events by over 40 years. However, I found that their recollections were very clear and agreed with the reconstruction of events from letters and articles of that time.

The material that was the most difficult to collate regarded the private lives of Jeffreys and Phillips. Although there were many letters exchanged between the two men regarding denominational business, there were few occasions when personal matters were allowed to intrude. Albert Edsor, Jeffreys' constant companion, is the person who had access to most information about Jeffreys. Accordingly, the thesis has relied on the interview conducted with Edsor for some personal details. However, a fully rounded picture of George Jeffreys is obscured by Edsor. His reminiscences revolve predominantly around Jeffreys' public ministry and the perceived treachery of Elim. Regarding Phillips, an interview with his wife, shortly before her death, produced the only information that related to his personal life. Phillips was a man wholly dedicated to the Elim Movement who had little time for any private activities. His wife was very elderly, though coherent, when interviewed. Since they had no children it was not possible to verify some of the more personal details concerning their life together. Accounts of Elim's history that have been produced previously have neglected Jeffreys and Phillips as private individuals, concentrating exclusively on their actions as denominational leaders. The thesis has attempted to redress this but has had to acknowledge that, at times, the task was hampered through a lack of primary information.

It is commonly accepted that there can be no unbiased reporting of history. In writing the thesis I am aware of the factors that make up my own filter as I read the history. This presentation of the facts can only be my interpretation of events. However, my interpretation has been made after presenting the fullest account of this period of Elim's history. The exercise was not undertaken to vindicate individuals nor organisations but simply to review the history of the Movement at its most unsettling time, explain the complicated nature of Jeffreys' and Phillips' relationship, and explain how the Movement survived the fissure between the two men.

3. The Elim Pentecostal Church

The Elim Pentecostal Movement is the second largest Pentecostal denomination in Britain.¹⁰ The name 'Elim' originally designated the oasis that the children of Israel came upon during their wanderings in the wilderness (Exodus 15:27). A survey conducted in 1996, showed that the overall average Sunday attendance was 63,500.¹¹ There are 432 churches in the United Kingdom, Channel Isles and Ireland, and a further 146 branch churches,¹² 'daughter' churches that are still attached to the 'mother' church.

¹⁰ The largest being the Assemblies of God; there are numerous other 'classical' Pentecostal churches, many being in the African-Caribbean tradition.

¹¹ Figures, based on a sample of 226 churches, presented to the 1997 Elim Conference.

¹² 110 of these branch churches are affiliated to the largest Elim church, Kensington Temple, London.

4. A brief historical survey: 1915-1950

The following account is a brief overview of the history of the Elim Pentecostal Church from its beginning in 1915 to 1950.¹³ This section has no references to sources, since all the events included here will be dealt with in much greater detail throughout the thesis.

The 'Elim Evangelistic Band', founded in Monaghan by George Jeffreys in 1915, was a small, tight-knit group committed to the concept of preaching the 'full gospel'. This message consisted of Jesus being saviour, baptiser in the Spirit, healer and coming King. In time, grateful converts and followers began to donate money and property to the new group; consequently, on the advice of a lawyer, John Leech K.C., the Elim Pentecostal Alliance was created to administer the property held by the group. On transferring their focus of activities to England in 1922, a constitution was introduced. This was subsequently revised twice before 1929, when the Elim Pentecostal Alliance, which had incorporated the earlier Evangelistic Band, became the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance.

In April 1934, a Deed Poll was signed which transferred administrative control of the Movement from a group of Overseers to an Executive Council of nine men. Differing interpretations of church government, secondary doctrinal

¹³ A brief history of the Elim Church was written by M. Hathaway in 1998. Entitled "The Elim Pentecostal Church: Origins, Development and Distinctives" it was published in Warrington, K. (ed.) Pentecostal Perspectives (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1998), 1-39. Since this was published at the time of the final editing of this thesis, the chapter is acknowledged but it has not been possible for any critical engagement with the material to have been undertaken.

issues, and personality clashes led to George Jeffreys resigning his position as leader and member of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance in 1939.

Subsequent negotiations resulted in Jeffreys returning to be the leader, although in 1940 his second and final resignation was tendered. He created a new denomination, the Bible Pattern Fellowship.

The post-war years were difficult times for the Elim Movement. The loss of their prominent leader and the resultant loss of public confidence, combined with the effects of the Second World War, led to a period of declension within the churches. However, after a period of intensive evangelism, leading to the establishing of churches in the late 1940s and early 1950s, it became clear that Elim would be able to survive as a denomination even with the loss of their charismatic founder. Although Jeffreys continued his evangelistic endeavours, post-war British society had radically changed and he never achieved the same success as he had seen in the inter-war period. The Bible Pattern Fellowship churches were never numerically strong and in time many rejoined Elim.

5. The contemporary church government of Elim

Since this thesis will examine in detail the changes made to Elim's church governmental policy, it is necessary to delineate present procedures, in order to demonstrate the historical evolution of its ecclesiastical organisation. It should be noted that most of the basis for the following was first suggested by Jeffreys prior to his departure from Elim, though only implemented after he had left the Movement.

The Elim Church is governed by the Conference, which meets annually.¹⁴ The Conference consists of a Representative Session, which is an equal gathering of ministers and lay representatives, and the Ministerial Session, which only includes ordained ministers.¹⁵ The Ministerial Session deals with matters that are considered to be of exclusive concern to the ministers, e.g. the admission and continuance of ministers, ordination, matters of ministerial character and discipline, ministerial fidelity to the doctrinal standards of the Alliance, pastoral efficiency, appointment of the stationing committee, 'and all ministerial and pastoral subjects of like nature'.¹⁶ However, the governing decisions are taken by the joint Ministerial and Lay Representative Conference. Any unanimous decision taken by the Conference is binding upon it. Up to 1998, membership of the Conference was only open to men,¹⁷ who were to be over the age of 25 years and a leader in a local church.¹⁸

The Conference has the power to determine the General Rules of the Alliance, amend and revoke its working arrangements, appoint its Officers and oversee its financial transactions. The Conference elects an Executive Council to effect the decisions of the Conference, and to undertake the administrative details.¹⁹

The national work is divided into regions, each having its own Regional Superintendent, who is elected into this position by the ministers and lay representatives from within the region.²⁰ Presbyteries consist of a smaller

¹⁴ The Constitution of the Elim Pentecostal Church (Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance) (Cheltenham: Elim Pentecostal Church, 1994 edition), 8-9.

¹⁵ Ibid., 6-7.

¹⁶ Ibid., 7.

¹⁷ Ibid., 16.

¹⁸ Ibid., 24.

¹⁹ Ibid., 11-12.

²⁰ Ibid., 12.

grouping of churches in a locality. Constitutionally, their purpose is to work together to open new churches;²¹ more usually, they exist to provide fellowship for the ministers. They have a District Superintendent who is elected by the ministers and lay representatives of the respective presbytery.²²

Each church has a leadership session, consisting of the pastor/s, together with elders and/or deacons. Each church is able to decide its own procedure for the election of local church leaders. This procedure is lodged with Headquarters.²³ The church session is responsible for the general oversight of the church, although the minister has the responsibility for the services.²⁴ Although the minister is appointed for an indefinite period, the church session may terminate the appointment at any time. This is done in consultation with the Regional Superintendent, who may feel that the church should be consulted and a secret ballot taken before a decision is made. A minister may request a move or the Executive Council may request that a minister move at any time.²⁵

The membership of the church is open to any who are 'born again'.²⁶ The only persons who may not be accepted as members are freemasons.²⁷ The members of the church session are expected to abstain from smoking and drinking.²⁸ Every church sends a tithe of its total general income to Headquarters; of this tithe, 'nine-twentieths (is) for Administration,

²¹ Ibid., 28.

²² Ibid., 32.

²³ Ibid., 35.

²⁴ Ibid., 33.

²⁵ Ibid., 35.

²⁶ Ibid., 36.

²⁷ Ibid., 36.

²⁸ Ibid., 48.

seven-fortieths (is) for the Pastoral Care and Removal Funds, seven-twentieths (is) for Regional Funds, and one fortieth (is) for the Emergency Welfare Fund'.²⁹ The local church submits monthly, quarterly and annual returns to Headquarters. These annual accounts are audited as required by the Charity Commissioners.³⁰

²⁹ Ibid., 39.
³⁰ Ibid., 39.

2. Review of Literature

The review of the following literature is designed to provide an assessment of all the published material that refers to the split between Jeffreys and the Elim Pentecostal Church. As has been previously stated, these works are deemed to be flawed, whether for being too inadequate in their assessment or because they are partisan, or based on previously published partisan works. The inclusion of this literature review is for the sake of completion; it should be noted that in the writing of this thesis these works have rarely been used. The account that will follow will be a fresh interpretation of the primary documents.

The following review of the published literature on the split has been organised in a manner that shows how the various works have influenced each other.

The foundational work on the split in Elim is that of Noel Brooks. A partisan account written in the mid-1940s, it influenced Wilson, whose work, in turn, was used by Hollenweger and Nichol. Edsor included Brooks' material in his own works. Edsor is the fiercest uncritical exponent of Jeffreys' actions. In part, Cartwright's work was an attempt to discredit Wilson's thesis on the grounds that his information was faulty. Walker based his short account on a mixture of Wilson and Cartwright. The short account given by Gee will be examined, as will be the writings of Atter and Nichol, who both relied on Gee.

Noel Brooks: Fight for the Faith and Freedom (London: The Pattern Bookroom, 1948)

Sources: Although the book has neither footnotes, nor a bibliography, it is very clear from the inclusion of lengthy quotations that the following sources were used: Landau's word-portrait of Jeffreys,³¹ Gee's The Pentecostal Movement,³² the magazines Elim Evangel,³³ The Pattern,³⁴ A Coming of Age Souvenir of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance,³⁵ and The Foursquare Gospel Revival Mirror.³⁶ Letters from Jeffreys to the Executive Council,³⁷ and pamphlets circulated by Jeffreys and Elim were also used.³⁸

Brooks was one of the Elim ministers who left to join Jeffreys' Bible Pattern Fellowship after the split in 1940. His book, published by the latter denomination's publishing house, was a trenchant defence of Jeffreys' actions and a virulent attack on the Elim Movement. According to Brooks, the central issue was that Jeffreys, the revivalist, wished to become a reformer and that this was too threatening to people around him; consequently, he was marginalised. According to this theory, Elim's hierarchy had become tyrannical; by attempting to reform it, Jeffreys set himself against a monolithic institution.

³¹ Landau, R. God is my Adventure (London: Faber and Faber, 1942² [1935]) cf. Brooks, N., Fight for the Faith and Freedom (London: The Pattern Bookroom, 1948), 20,28.
³² Brooks, 32.
³³ Ibid., 55f.
³⁴ Ibid., 62f.
³⁵ Ibid., 20.
³⁶ Ibid., 28f.
³⁷ Ibid., 48,68,70,71,81.
³⁸ Ibid., 57 passim, 92ff.

For Brooks, the decisive events were the signing of the Deed Poll in 1934, the illnesses of Jeffreys and Phillips and the impact that the ecclesiology of Lewi Pethrus in Sweden had on Jeffreys. Brooks assumed that the signing of the Deed Poll was a blunder since it ensured that the nine ministers, who were the signatories, 'made themselves the legal governors over all Elim Alliance churches, pastors, properties and finances throughout the British Isles'.³⁹ Brooks emphasised that Jeffreys only signed the Deed after having been falsely assured by Phillips that it would not infringe on the freedom of individual churches.⁴⁰ Phillips' illness and absence from his office at Headquarters gave Jeffreys time to examine the Movement and determine to 'reform it, or to renounce it and to deliver as many churches as possible from its Babylonish bondage'.⁴¹ The study of Pethrus' ministry gave Jeffreys the impetus to change things because he could see that a different ecclesiology, one that included laity, could work successfully.

Brooks viewed the arguments concerning the identification of Britain with Israel as peripheral to the main issues. He argued that Elim Headquarters continued to present this as a problem so that the reforms would not be introduced. According to Brooks, for Jeffreys the argument about the British Israel identification was 'providential', since it served to bring home the lesson of all history, that 'central clerical control tends towards tyranny'.⁴²

³⁹ Ibid., 9.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 10.

⁴¹ Ibid., 57.

⁴² Ibid., 53.

The value of Brooks' work is that it is the earliest published book concerning the split, and had an ongoing influence on other accounts. However, the work is unashamedly partisan and therefore uncritical of Jeffreys. The view that the problems over the British Israel identification were exacerbated by the Executive Council, who used them to halt governmental changes, is presented without any supporting evidence.

Cartwright dismissed Brooks' work on the grounds that Brooks withdrew his work from circulation in 1952.⁴³ However, in 1986, writing a foreword to Edsor's book, Brooks argued that his decision to withdraw his account of the split was for 'personal reasons', not because there were factual inaccuracies.⁴⁴

Albert W. Edsor: George Jeffreys: Man of God (London: Ludgate Press, 1964); In Defence of a Man of God Falsely Portrayed: An Open Letter to Ministers and Peoples of the Elim Movement, the Assemblies of God, and the Bible-Pattern Fellowship, 25 July, 1986 (Gloucester: Garamond Original); 'Set Your House in Order'. God's call to George Jeffreys as the Founder of the Elim Pentecostal Movement (Chichester: New Wine Press, 1989).

Sources: Brooks' Fight for the Faith and Freedom, Elim Evangel, The Pattern, personal recollection.

⁴³ Cartwright, D. The Great Evangelists (Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering, 1986), 139.

⁴⁴ Brooks in Edsor, A.W. In Defence of a Man of God Falsely Portrayed (Gloucester: Garamond Original, 1986), 22.

For 34 years Edsor was the pianist at Jeffreys' meetings and his personal secretary. During this time he also shared a house with Jeffreys. As such, he is the one who could shed most light on any personal motives behind Jeffreys' split with Elim. However, his works suffer from his unquestioning loyalty to Jeffreys' memory; there is no critical comment on any of the actions that Jeffreys took. He also restricts his narrative of the events to a reiteration of Jeffreys' pamphlets which were published from 1939 onwards. Edsor writes defensively: in George Jeffreys: Man of God, he attacked Elim for their treatment of Jeffreys; in In Defence of a Man of God Falsely Portrayed, he accused Cartwright and Walker of misrepresenting Jeffreys;⁴⁵ in Set Your House in Order, he wrote against the background of a perceived double act of treachery, the original one being Elim's attack on Jeffreys, a subsequent one being committed by the Bible Pattern Fellowship themselves. In 1984, the nine member Advisory Committee of the Bible Pattern Fellowship came into fellowship with Elim. Two of them became Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance ministers; the others joined the Elim Church Incorporated. Edsor condemned this 'spurious unity-cum- reconciliation'⁴⁶ as a betrayal of that for which Jeffreys had contended.⁴⁷

Edsor's central claim is that Jeffreys' 'traumatic severance from the Elim Movement he loved and faithfully served for 25 years, (was) on the issue of

⁴⁵ In particular, he attacked Cartwright's assertion that after Jeffreys' left Elim he descended into obscurity (Edsor, 1986, 3) and Walker's suggestion that 'despite occasional whiffs of scandal surrounding his sexuality, there is not the slightest historical evidence that Jeffreys was homosexual' (Ibid., 26).

⁴⁶ Edsor, A.W., 'Set Your House in Order'. God's call to George Jeffreys as the founder of the Elim Pentecostal Movement (Chichester: New Wine Press, 1989), 118.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 119.

Church government and that issue alone'.⁴⁸ The issues surrounding the British Israel identification are dismissed as being irrelevant in the split since Jeffreys had not wanted to make these views mandatory, simply one of the possible prophetic positions taken by ministers and churches.⁴⁹ Edsor argued that the central issue lay in Jeffreys' attempt to introduce a more enlightened church government policy. As part of his argument, he reprinted Commander Macmillan's appreciative review of Wilson's Sects and Society in both books.⁵⁰ Wilson's view, that the Movement was at the mercy of the bureaucrat who sought to limit the popularity of the charismatic leader, was stressed.⁵¹

Much of the books' contents concentrated on outlining the numbers of people to whom Jeffreys preached and the impact he had on individuals through his gift of healing. Factually, Edsor is accurate; where there is disagreement is in his interpretation of the facts. The accounts present Jeffreys as the victim of a Machiavellian plot to remove him from his own Movement.⁵² This inevitably results in a lack of any critical engagement with Jeffreys himself. Black, reviewing Set Your House in Order, characterised Edsor as 'a faithful dog keeping vigil at the grave of a beloved master and prepared to fight all comers'.⁵³

⁴⁸ Edsor, (1986), 2.

⁴⁹ Edsor, (1989), 124-125.

⁵⁰ Edsor, A.W., George Jeffreys: Man of God (London: Ludgate Press, 1964), 89-108; (1989), 103-123. This review, "The Take-Over Technique in Modern Church History Transition from Charisma to Legalism", was first published in The Pattern, October 1961.

⁵¹ Edsor, (1964) 97-98.

⁵² Ibid., 94.

⁵³ Black, H.B. Review: Set Your House In Order by A.W. Edsor, EPTA Bulletin 8:4, (1989) 181.

Bryan Wilson: Sects and Society: The Sociology of Three Religious Groups in Britain, (London: Heinemann, 1961)

Main Sources: Gee (1942), Brooks (1948), Elim Evangel, The Foursquare Gospel Revival Mirror. Bryan Wilson attempted to make contact with Jeffreys and Phillips in 1953, but was unsuccessful. Therefore, he spoke to 'a young man who had an executive position in Elim but was too young to have been involved in any way in the dispute between 1933-40'.⁵⁴ He felt that not meeting the two men had been advantageous since it allowed him to be more objective.⁵⁵ Wilson undertook research for his chapters on Elim between 1954 and 1960.⁵⁶ At this time, the impact of the split was still relatively fresh in people's minds. The bulk of his material came from people who had been supportive of George Jeffreys; consequently, his arguments reflect that bias.⁵⁷

This is the fullest work on Elim that has been produced. He devoted five chapters of the book to Elim, looking at Elim's teachings, history, organisation, social teaching and practice, and social composition. Wilson's understanding of the events surrounding the resignation of Jeffreys was that the institutional power, as represented by E.J. Phillips, clashed with the charismatic authority of the evangelist, Jeffreys. He viewed Jeffreys as a man who had unwittingly created a denominational machine that sought to control and ultimately crush

⁵⁴ Letter B. Wilson to D. Macmillan, 7 November 1961, quoted in Edsor (1964), v.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ The book was published 1961.

⁵⁷ This was, and continued to be, Elim's major criticism of the book. In Elim Evangel, 3 July 1971, 14, T.H. Stevenson, commenting on Wilson's book, said, 'Wilson's great mistake was that almost all his complete source of information about Elim was outside Elim and not an impartial viewpoint.' Cf. Cartwright, 138.

him. Wilson claimed that although Jeffreys had begun as the leader of the Movement, he ceased to be in control of the actual day-to-day events, that position being taken by Phillips. Wilson wrote,

The familiar pattern of the charismatic leader's coming increasingly to rely on the technical, legal and administrative knowledge of the bureaucrat is apparent: routine administrative devices, written instructions and defined spheres of competence replace the spontaneity of charismatic impulse. The man who knows and formulates the techniques of routine administration supersedes the man who held power by sheer force of personality.⁵⁸

This follows Weber's emphasis on the power that is assumed by the legalised priesthood, in contrast to the charisma of the prophet. Weber wrote,

Secret lore recedes and the priestly doctrine becomes a scripturally established tradition which the priesthood interprets by means of dogmas.⁵⁹

Wilson believed that Jeffreys' real desire was to be an ecumenical evangelist, who became dissatisfied when he recognised that Elim was becoming just one of many Pentecostal denominations.⁶⁰ This awareness, exacerbated by the signing of the Deed Poll in 1934 when Jeffreys' powers were circumscribed, meant that Jeffreys no longer felt as free in his evangelistic work as he had done in the earlier times of his ministry.⁶¹ At this point, according to Wilson, Elim ministers began to rely on Phillips and the bureaucracy of the denomination, rather than on Jeffreys' evangelistic gifts.⁶² However, the reality of the situation is more complicated than Wilson indicated. From 1934, Jeffreys began to engage in less evangelistic work because he was concerned about the state of the churches he had already established. He wanted to turn

⁵⁸ Wilson, B., Sects and Society: The Sociology of Three Religious Groups in Britain, (London: Heinemann, 1961), 44-45.

⁵⁹ Weber, M. The Sociology of Religion (E.T. E. Fischhoff) (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964⁴), 68.

⁶⁰ Wilson, 43.

⁶¹ Ibid., 45.

⁶² Ibid., 46.

his efforts to reforming the Movement; he was no longer content to be solely engaged in revivalism. There is no indication that Phillips and the Executive Council wanted to curtail Jeffreys' evangelistic activity. On the contrary, as will be seen, on occasions they expressed their wish to Jeffreys that he should recommence his evangelistic ministry.

For Wilson, the crucial time was the period of Phillips' sickness in 1937. He believed that Jeffreys saw for the first time how much power was invested in Headquarters. According to Wilson, Jeffreys responded to this power base by demanding local church government and lay representation.⁶³ Wilson does not explain why Jeffreys had argued for these two elements previously, as early as 1933. The reconstruction of events in this thesis demonstrates that by the time of Phillips' illness, the problems between the two men, and therefore between Jeffreys and the whole of the Executive Council, were well established. Whilst Wilson recognised that the British Israel question did have a central part to play in the disruption of the relationship between both men, he gave no explanation for this. Generally, he believed that it was Jeffreys' own struggle with the organisational forms of Elim that was the determining factor in the split.⁶⁴ He gave no indication of any elements in Jeffreys' or Phillips' personalities that might have precipitated the deterioration in their relationship.

The abiding value of Wilson's work lies in his adaptation of Weber's theory of the "routinization of charisma". This explanation for the actions and reactions

⁶³ Ibid., 48.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 41.

of Jeffreys and Phillips seems to be accurate and the events seem to fit the classic Weberian scenario. The impression is given that Jeffreys was happiest when he was the revivalist, able to make decisions unilaterally, responding to crises with creative ideas suggested on the spur of the moment. This is in contrast to Phillips who was less impulsive and more able to discern the long-term implications of any decisions taken. Certainly, after Jeffreys left Elim the Movement became less charismatic in its methodology and more bureaucratic in its government. The charismatic evangelists, such as P.S. Brewster who helped the Movement survive, did so within a framework that ensured that the charismatic evangelists would not be able to overly influence the denomination to the extent that Jeffreys had done.

However, Wilson may have fallen into a simplistic trap of siding with the more attractive, charismatic figure of Jeffreys, against the appearance of the impersonal, bureaucratic figure of Phillips.⁶⁵ Whilst he has read much of the material from Jeffreys' point of view, he does not show evidence of knowing the frustration that Phillips had with Jeffreys when new schemes were being suggested at a prodigious rate. Although he believed that he was at an advantage in not having met the two characters, had he met Phillips he would have received the story from a different point of view which might have encouraged him to investigate some of the underlying reasons for their reactions. Phillips never viewed the issue as being localised in the question of power for power's sake; he believed that his task was to save the Movement

⁶⁵ Alternatively, perhaps his attachment to the sociological model of charismatic routinization made him Procrustean with the empirical facts.

from the destructive actions of Jeffreys. In Wilson's defence, it is quite possible that Phillips would not have been willing to meet him at any time. Lancaster admitted that it might have been Elim's 'lack of candour in a bygone age that deprived Wilson of a great deal of important material,'⁶⁶ and thus led him to write, in the view of Elim members, an unbalanced account of the events.

The book was not reviewed in the Elim Evangel as Phillips felt that such an action would only advertise it. Phillips, unsurprisingly, fundamentally disagreed with Wilson's interpretations of the facts, arguing that Jeffreys left because the many changes he proposed were not accepted by the Executive Council.⁶⁷ He discounted the charisma versus legalism formulation, arguing, 'There has been so much change and the resignation of Principal Jeffreys from Elim was for a very different reason'.⁶⁸

**Walter Hollenweger: The Pentecostals (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988³
[London: SCM 1972])**

Main Sources: Wilson, Gee.

Hollenweger's monumental work was the authoritative work on world-wide Pentecostalism for many years. Since the original doctoral thesis was written in 1966, even though it was updated subsequently, Hollenweger himself

⁶⁶ Lancaster, J. "Review: Restoring the Kingdom" Elim Evangel 7 December 1985, 4.

⁶⁷ Phillips, E.J. Unpub. draft reply to W. Hollenweger. n.d.

⁶⁸ Ibid. This criticism of Wilson notwithstanding, it is interesting that in the Elim Evangel 22 July 1972, 12-13, an article entitled "Sociology and Pentecost" appeared. Written by an Assemblies of God lecturer at Oxford University, Valentine Cunningham, it was a defence of Wilson's work on the Pentecostal minister in Patterns of Sectarianism (London: Heinemann, 1967).

recognised that the work provided a limited assessment of Pentecostalism as seen in the 1960s.⁶⁹ His chapter on the Elim churches was heavily dependant on Wilson; of the 48 footnotes, 16 are attributed to Wilson. He referred to Wilson's study as 'illuminating' and repeated the thesis that Jeffreys had become alarmed at the institution that he had created. Hollenweger recognised, however, the criticisms levelled by the leaders of Elim against Wilson's work, although gave no footnoted evidence of how he discovered this. There is one sentence given to explaining the split from Elim's point of view. Using Gee as a source, he indicated that Elim believed that Jeffreys left because of British Israelism.⁷⁰

Hollenweger advanced no new evidence in his explanation of the split, but rather re-presented Wilson's work. The work was criticised in a review by Bradley who rejected 'the charismatic versus legalistic dichotomy theory', and suggested that overall, Hollenweger's views of British Pentecostalism were 'completely unrealistic'. Bradley believed that since there were so many misjudgements made concerning British Pentecostalism, the value of the rest of the book's assertions were equally in doubt.⁷¹ In Hollenweger's recent work, Pentecostalism, he has modified his earlier explanation by stating, 'The charisma/institutional divide only works if charisma is seen in a 'Weberian' and not a Pauline sense'.⁷²

⁶⁹ Hollenweger, W., The Pentecostals (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988³ [London: SCM 1972]), xxvii.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 199.

⁷¹ Bradley, J.T. "Review: The Pentecostals" Elim Evangel 20 May 1972, 9. At this time Bradley was the Secretary-General of Elim.

⁷² Hollenweger, W. Pentecostalism (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997), 260.

Desmond Cartwright: The Great Evangelists (Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering, 1986)

Main Sources: Primary papers.

Cartwright is the official Elim historian and has researched the development of British Pentecostalism over a number of years. The archive he has overseen at the Donald Gee Centre, Mattersey, is becoming renowned as a central resource for the study of European Pentecostalism. Cartwright's book does not have footnotes, nor a bibliography, although it is clear that he is working from the original letters exchanged between Jeffreys and Phillips and is aware of the other key works. He dismissed Wilson's contention that Jeffreys had lost sight of the actual running of the Movement, noting, 'Even a brief acquaintance with the correspondence will show that this is untrue'.⁷³ Equally, he disagreed with Wilson that the clash was between the charismatic leader and the bureaucrat. He argued that this was to 'over simplify the whole situation'.⁷⁴ Cartwright argued that the key issues revolved around Jeffreys' illness, in particular the change of personality that ensued due to his diabetic condition, and the panic that Jeffreys encountered when he realised the financial situation of the Movement. According to Cartwright, at that time Jeffreys became almost impossible to work with. Cartwright wrote,

George Jeffreys had been the easiest of men to work with in the early period. Now, largely as a result of his illness, and possibly also through the influence of others there was a distinct change in his attitude.⁷⁵

⁷³ Cartwright, D., The Great Evangelists (Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering, 1986), 133.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 150.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 150.

However, Cartwright does not provide clear evidence of the exact nature of Jeffreys' illness, nor of the alleged personality changes that took place in his character.

Cartwright suggested that British Israelism was not the main cause of the split, but was a contributory factor in the events.⁷⁶ He argued that Jeffreys was mistaken in the actions he took, but that Elim Headquarters' officers exacerbated the situation, noting that 'they could be stubborn and unbelievably pedantic'.⁷⁷ The cause of the split, according to Cartwright, did not concern any single disagreement, but was a result of the constant prevarication concerning church government that Jeffreys demonstrated.⁷⁸ Cartwright gave no clear reason why Jeffreys wanted to introduce these changes, nor why Phillips was so adamant that they should not be introduced.

There are a number of weakness' in Cartwright's account. For example, although he recounts the extent of Jeffreys' success in detail, Jeffreys' second and final resignation from the Movement in November 1940 is not even mentioned. Cartwright was clearly hindered by the scope of the book; it was designed to be the story of both Stephen and George Jeffreys, and in trying to explain the split in 1939, he could not go into too much detail. This led Edsor to criticise what he saw as a 'garbled account of the facts'.⁷⁹ Similarly, the life of George Jeffreys after 1940 is dealt with very inadequately, the period

⁷⁶ Ibid., 125.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 139.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 140.

⁷⁹ Edsor, (1989) 95.

between 1940-62 being covered in one paragraph. Van der Laan observed that this gave the impression that Jeffreys' life was only being viewed from Elim's perspective.⁸⁰ There is no indication given about how the Movement continued after Jeffreys' departure.

The following works mention the split, but since this is done in the context of much wider issues, their treatment is brief.

Donald Gee: Wind and Flame (Croydon: Heath Press, 1967). Incorporating The Pentecostal Movement (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1941).

Main Sources: Unknown, although evidence of the use of the Elim Evangel can be seen on occasions when matters pertaining to Elim are discussed.⁸¹ As the editor of Pentecost, he received press releases from all the Pentecostal publications. Some of his material would also have been gained through his personal relationships with the respective personalities.

This is the most thorough work on the origins and development of British Pentecostalism up to 1964. As such, it marked the end of the Pentecostal era, and the beginning of the Charismatic Movement, with all the attendant changes that were introduced.

⁸⁰ Van der Laan, C. "Review: The Great Evangelists", EPTA Bulletin 5:3, 100.

⁸¹ Cf. Gee's quotation regarding Phillips' experience of the baptism in the Spirit (Wind and Flame (Croydon: Heath Press, 1967), 64-65), it produced a 'more radical change than conversion'. The same phrase appeared in Phillips, E.J. "A Spiritual Revolution" Elim Evangel 19 June 1936, 396.

His comments on the split were very brief. He referred to it as the 'sad division',⁸² a 'difficult period of internal re-adjustment' which was due to the divergence between Jeffreys' personal policy and that of the Annual Conference.⁸³ Regarding the development of Elim and the Bible Pattern Fellowship he gave evidence of Jeffreys' ongoing evangelistic ministry,⁸⁴ but hinted that the Bible Pattern Fellowship did not provide the innovative church structure that had been promised and expected. He believed that the Pattern structure had merely duplicated that of the Assemblies of God.⁸⁵ According to his account, Elim recovered quickly from the split. Elim, he wrote, involved themselves in 'good constructive work that within a short space of time tended to bury the barren controversies of the past'.⁸⁶ Although Gee can be acclaimed as the first British Pentecostal historian, his account of the split and the destabilising effect it had on the Movement was underplayed in this work.

Gordon F. Atter The Third Force (Peterborough, Ontario: College Press, 1970³ [1962]).

Main Source: Gee.

Atter, in a brief reference, called the split 'an unfortunate division'.⁸⁷ He indicated that Jeffreys wanted to introduce a congregational church government, whereby he could promote British Israelism. His account is too

⁸² Gee, 275.

⁸³ Ibid., 181.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 243.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 181.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 182.

⁸⁷ Atter, G.F. The Third Force (Peterborough, Ontario: College Press, 1970³), 109.

short to warrant a long response, but it is indicative of the simplistic explanation that has been proffered in the past for the events of 1940.

John T. Nichol The Pentecostals (Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos, 1966)

Main Sources: Wilson, Gee.

Nichol made a very brief reference to the split in Elim, referring to Elim's bureaucratic organisation whereby all the power lay with the Executive Council.⁸⁸ His account is not significant, except as another example of Wilson's influence.

Andrew Walker: Restoring the Kingdom (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988² [1985]).

Main Sources: Cartwright, Gee, Hollenweger, Wilson.

Walker's book was an examination of the Restorationist movement in Britain. As part of his work, he examined, briefly, the emergence of the major Pentecostal movements. Walker followed Wilson's 'excellent account'⁸⁹ of the split and his explanation that the clash was the result of the differences between the charismatic figure of Jeffreys and the bureaucratic leadership style of Phillips.⁹⁰ He recounted that many Elim people believed Jeffreys' 'fall' to be due to various reasons including spiritual pride, an unstable personality and

⁸⁸ Nichol, J.T. The Pentecostals (Plainfield, NJ: Logos, 1966), 183.

⁸⁹ Walker, A., Restoring the Kingdom (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988²), 257.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 255.

doctrinal deviation.⁹¹ Walker himself believed the split to be a result of 'multi-causal factors'.⁹² He highlighted the extent to which Jeffreys had become obsessed with British Israelism, suggesting that the doctrine had 'unhinged' Jeffreys. However, his suggestion that Jeffreys wanted to make it a mandatory doctrinal agreement in the Movement was incorrect.⁹³

Walker's short account is more balanced than most. He has taken into account Wilson's thesis and yet has acknowledged the problems that Jeffreys presented to Elim.⁹⁴ However, Lancaster, reviewing the work criticised Walker for relying on Wilson so heavily, since it was 'not a balanced account'. Lancaster's assessment of Wilson was that he had become an unreliable authority, influencing others heavily, even though his conclusions had been 'inadequately based'.⁹⁵

⁹¹ Ibid., 257.

⁹² Ibid., 258.

⁹³ Ibid. This mistake has been rectified in the 1998 revised edition of Restoring the Kingdom (Guildford: Eagle, 1998).

⁹⁴ Ibid., 264-265.

⁹⁵ Lancaster, op. cit., 4.

Part One: Implicit Reasons for the Split

The following section will demonstrate that there were four implicit reasons for the final discription of the Elim Pentecostal Church in 1940 and that these factors were connected with Jeffreys' theological formation, his evangelistic success and his inter-personal relationships.

The first of these implicit reasons relates directly to Jeffreys' character.

Jeffreys, emerging out of the Welsh Revival, held to strong opinions concerning the nature and availability of revival that differed from those of his peers. It will be argued that this set him apart from his peers. It will be further demonstrated that the emphasis he placed on controlling spiritual spontaneity enabled him to protect his position as the sole charismatic leader within the Movement.

Secondly, although he was part of the general theological development amongst Pentecostals concerning pneumatology, at times he was content to hold minority views. Whilst his views on the Spirit were not of ultimate significance in the final split, the fact that he was prepared to hold to minority viewpoints was highly critical. Thirdly, his own assessment of his evangelistic ministry bolstered his belief that he was able to reform the church that he had begun. Therefore, the success of his evangelistic ministry will be viewed against the social context of the day. Finally, his relationships with peers, church leaders and the general public in Elim will be examined. As the thesis develops it will become clear that the division was primarily between the two leaders of the Movement, Jeffreys and Phillips. Therefore, their personalities,

experiences and interpretation of events will be contrasted in an attempt to explain their subsequent actions.

In pursuing these issues it will be argued that Jeffreys always saw himself as different from his peers, was willing to hold divergent doctrinal views and was prone to experiencing difficulties in his relationships. These implicit features involved in the split between Jeffreys and Elim, although they have not been dealt with in any of the other accounts of the division, provide significant explanations for the breakdown of the relationship between Jeffreys and Elim.

1 The Welsh Revival

British evangelicals entered the twentieth century with an escalating belief that God would make himself known to the nation in an act that would be significant, visible and possibly a final act before the return of Jesus to earth.⁹⁶ It is against this background that the Welsh Revival erupted in 1904.⁹⁷ This revival became a powerful influence on the Pentecostal movement for two fundamental reasons. Firstly, some of the early Pentecostals, including George Jeffreys, were converted during this period.⁹⁸ Secondly, and more significantly, this move of God became a bench-mark for expectations concerning true revival.⁹⁹ In discussions concerning revival within Elim, however, Jeffreys held views that differed substantially to those of his colleagues. It will be suggested that Jeffreys' willingness to hold to a distinctive expectation of his own ministry presaged the tenacity he exhibited in his future discussions concerning the direction of the denomination.

⁹⁶ Phillips, D.M. Evan Roberts: The Great Welsh Revivalist and His Work (London: Marshall Bros., 1906), 291; Evans, E. The Welsh Revival of 1904 (London: Evangelical Press, 1969), 39; Orr, J.E. Evangelical Awakenings 1900-1975 (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975), 1.

⁹⁷ Blumhofer (E.L. "Alexander Boddy and the Rise of Pentecostalism" Pneuma 8:1 (1986), 31) claimed, 'This revival from its beginnings in 1904 claimed to be the 'latter rain' of the end-times.'

⁹⁸ For example, Stephen Jeffreys was converted on 17 November 1904 at Siloh Chapel, Nantyfflon. Jeffreys, E. Stephen Jeffreys: The Beloved Evangelist (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1946), 3. George Jeffreys, Donald Gee and Daniel P. Williams were all converted during this period, Walker, 248.

⁹⁹ For references to the impact of the Welsh Revival on the formation of British Pentecostalism generally, see: Bloch-Hoell, N. The Pentecostal Movement (London: Allen & Unwin, 1964); Gee, (1967); Hollenweger, (1988); Hathaway, M., in Warrington, op. cit.; Kay, W. A History of the British Assemblies of God (PhD. Diss., University of Nottingham, 1989); Kay, W. Inside Story (Mattersey: Mattersey Hall Publishing, 1990); Kay, W. "Assemblies of God: Distinctive Continuity and Distinctive Change" in Warrington, op. cit., 40-63; Worsfield, J. The Origins of the Apostolic Church in Great Britain (Wellington, New Zealand: Julian Literature Trust, 1991).

1. A comparison between Jeffreys' and Phillips' social backgrounds and conversion experiences

George Jeffreys was born on 28 February 1889 at 24 Metcalfe Street, Maesteg, Wales, to Thomas and Kezia Jeffreys, part of a family that would eventually include eleven other children.¹⁰⁰ Jeffreys was converted, aged 15 years, in November 1904, the year that the Welsh Revival began; his whole life and ministry would reflect the fact that he had been impacted by the Welsh Revival. Phillips' background, in terms of social background and Christian experience, was markedly different. Phillips was born on 30 December 1893, into a small Christian family in Bedford.¹⁰¹ Whereas Jeffreys had become a Christian as a young man, after he had begun work, Phillips made a commitment to Christ as a very young child.¹⁰² This occurred before the Welsh Revival began. Indeed, Phillips never indicated that the Welsh Revival had made any direct impact on his family. Jeffreys' family was from the relatively deprived area of South Wales;¹⁰³ Phillips' family had connections to the wealthy Jewish aristocracy.¹⁰⁴ Jeffreys, a frail child,¹⁰⁵ was shielded by his mother from entering employment in the mining industry, and found an alternative position as an errand boy for

¹⁰⁰ Letter, D. Cartwright to author, 16 June 1997.

¹⁰¹ He had two brothers and one sister. Frederic Barrs (1896-1979) was manager of the Elim Publishing company, Hubert Cyril (1891-1973) was involved in missions work in South Africa. All the brothers were referred to by their initials. E.J. Phillips would have always been called 'Mr Phillips' to his face, but 'E.J.' when he was being referred to. His wife called him by his second name, John. His sister, Dorothy, had been a missionary in India, but died of leukaemia in middle-age, in 1961.

¹⁰² Phillips, E.J., "A Spiritual Revolution" Elim Evangel 19 June 1936, 396.

¹⁰³ Cartwright, 14.

¹⁰⁴ His father, John (1847-1931) had been cut off from his family after his conversion from Judaism to Christianity. According to Mary Stormont, a relation of Phillips, John Phillips had been related to the South African financier and chairman of the Central Mining and Investment Corporation, Sir Lionel Phillips. M. Stormont, Interview, 6 February 1998, Nantwich. For more details on Sir Lionel Phillips see Fraser, M., Sir Lionel Phillips (Parktown, South Africa: Parktown and Westcliff Heritage Trust: 1988) and Anglo-Jewish Notabilities Jewish Historical Society of England. (London: University College, 1955), 55.

¹⁰⁵ Jeffreys, G. Healing Rays (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1932), 56.

the Co-operative stores in Nantyllyn.¹⁰⁶ Phillips, after leaving school, went to work in an estate agency and learnt skills that would prove invaluable when he later involved himself in the legal work necessary to establish a new denomination. In the disagreements surrounding future arguments concerning finance, Phillips would be dismissive of Jeffreys' attempts to understand the accounts of the denomination.¹⁰⁷

The fact that the two men came from very different social backgrounds with different experiences of Christianity, in particular, would become significant in terms of their expectations of normal church life.

2. The impact of the Welsh Revival on Jeffreys

Jeffreys' views concerning revival were not the result of abstract theologising, but had been gained as a result of his own experiences as a young Christian. Having experienced the revival in Wales, Jeffreys longed to see Pentecostalism achieve similar results. Brooks wrote that it was apparent to everyone who heard him speak, whether in private or in public, that Jeffreys was 'indebted to the Welsh Revival not merely for his conversion but also for his dominating vision and passion for religious revival'.¹⁰⁸ In contrast, there is no record of Phillips ever mentioning the Welsh Revival specifically, or writing about revival generally.

¹⁰⁶ Cartwright, 19.

¹⁰⁷ Phillips told the 1939 Conference that Jeffreys was 'absolutely out of his depth in matters of organisation and business' and that Jeffreys had acknowledged his limited knowledge and inexperience. Appendix 1.

¹⁰⁸ Brooks, 22.

Although the Welsh Revival had begun to wane by 1906, Jeffreys joined his brother Stephen in attending midweek meetings led by William Hill at the home of Mr and Mrs Bedford, Bridgend Road, Cwmfelin. Hill, previously a Welsh Baptist pastor, had left the ministry after having been baptised in the Spirit.¹⁰⁹ There were many such groups that developed during this time. They called themselves 'Children of the Revival'; they were people, deeply affected by the Revival, who longed for God to continue the work that they had witnessed in the previous years. Because some had been ostracised from their churches and chapels, they met to worship in homes.¹¹⁰ Barratt designated these groups as the recipients of 'the fresh glorious flow of Revival grace and power' that the 'older Christian communities ... [had]...shut out'.¹¹¹ Their meetings were flexible, free of traditional ecclesiastical organisation, and the believers were expectant, fervent and desirous of more of God's blessing in their lives.¹¹² These house meetings, in which the Jeffreys' brothers were participants, became the natural loci for the later Pentecostal outpourings to find acceptance. Therefore, Jeffreys' initial experience of church life was the extraordinary fervour of the Welsh Revival and its aftermath.¹¹³ This influenced his expectation of normal church life. His experience of revival was that it had spectacular effects upon all who encountered it; his experience of church life was dominated by a stress on spontaneity and lack of clerical control.

¹⁰⁹ Cartwright, D. "Echoes from the Past" Elim Evangel 22 January 1983, 6.

¹¹⁰ Hathaway, W.G. Sound from Heaven (London: Victory Press, 1947), 5-6.

¹¹¹ Barratt, T.B. "Words and Works", vol. XXXIII (April 1911), 103f, quoted in Evans, (1969), 196.

¹¹² Hathaway (1947, 6) described the 'Children of the Revival' as being 'unfettered by conventional customs'.

¹¹³ Orr (15) suggests that in 1905 a tenth of the principality's population had been directly affected by the Welsh Revival. 'A social change of such magnitude touched all of society.'

3. Jeffreys' understanding of revival

Having been formed as the Elim Evangelistic Band by Jeffreys in the aftermath of the Welsh Revival, much of Elim's early existence and aspiration revolved around revival.¹¹⁴ Jeffreys' team that ministered with him was termed the 'Revival Party'.¹¹⁵ Jeffreys believed that revival, having been inaugurated at Pentecost, should be experienced constantly by every Christian and church. He wrote, 'The revival which the Church needs has arrived, and there will be no other.'¹¹⁶ He pointed to the ongoing life of the churches as evidence for this view; when holiness was taught, the fruit and the gifts of the Spirit manifested, obedience shown to Christ's commands by individuals and prayers answered, these were evidences of revival. He argued,

We see no other pattern for revival in the New Testament, and the church or leader who rejects this is rejecting the answer to their own prayers for revival.¹¹⁷

Jeffreys did not go into detail to expound his meaning. However, the significant point is that he believed he was the harbinger of revival and that the churches with which he was involved were experiencing revival. There was no need to pray for revival to come, it was present, evidenced by unexpectedly successful evangelistic endeavours.¹¹⁸ According to this

¹¹⁴ Editorial, "Revival" Elim Evangel 1 July 1938, 410.

¹¹⁵ Reports of Jeffreys' campaigns referred to them as revivals. For example, Edsor, A.W. "The Scottish Convention: Memorable Revival Scenes" Elim Evangel 27 January 1933, 61; "Principal and Party at Colwyn Bay, Revival Blessing - over 100 Conversions" Elim Evangel 1 July 1938, 410.

¹¹⁶ Jeffreys, G. Pentecostal Rays (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1933), 227.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 228.

¹¹⁸ McAlister (R. E. "The Pentecostal Movement" Elim Evangel January 1923, 16), referring to Jeffreys' meetings, wrote, 'These revivals have not been mere religious awakenings, but Holy Ghost conviction has caused real repentance and confession. As a result hundreds of thousands will praise God through all eternity for real salvation'. In an article entitled "What kind of revival may we expect?", Kingston (C. "The Revival we need" Elim Evangel 12 March 1945, 83) described revival as occurring when, 'We shall see a mysterious wave of religious fervour spreading everywhere over the land,

understanding, Jeffreys could legitimately refer to his own large meetings as revivals.¹¹⁹

In May 1915, Jeffreys sent a report to Confidence of the meetings held in Plymouth. His account of the meetings reported that revival had been experienced and as proof of that he pointed to the 'sinners of the deepest dye' who had been converted, 'being struck down in the meetings, while others tremble as though charged with a dynamo, caused (I believe) by conviction of sin'. Continuing his account, he wrote of people who testified that they had been baptised in the Spirit as they were walking on the streets.¹²⁰ The descriptions stressed the dramatic manifestations that accompanied conversions in a similar manner to those that had been experienced during the Welsh Revival. Jeffreys, in reporting his evangelistic success, was eager to indicate that this was not simply the work of a successful evangelist, it was revival.¹²¹ In an article in Confidence in 1913, Boddy quoted from a letter that Jeffreys sent him concerning services he was holding in South Wales. Jeffreys assured him that the scenes he was witnessing were those of 'a real Apostolic Revival'.¹²²

meetings continued perhaps for hours without a break, and the spiritual tension such that the mere giving out of a text will draw men to repentance'. Kingston's view here draws specifically from accounts of the Welsh Revival.

¹¹⁹ See, for example, the descriptions of the meetings held in Birmingham during Spring 1930. They were reported in the following editions of the Elim Evangel April 11, 18, 25; May 2, 9, 16, 23, 30; June 6, 13, 20, 27; July 4 passim.

¹²⁰ "A revival at Plymouth, Two reports", Confidence May 1915, 89. However, it is interesting that after six weeks of such meetings, mostly being held twice a day, only 40 people had been baptised in the Spirit. Twenty of these people received this baptism in one meeting.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Boddy, A.A. "An Apostolic Welsh Revival" Confidence, February 1913, 28.

However, it is clear that Jeffreys' view of the immediacy of revival was not readily accepted by all the pastors within Elim. Most did not see the same results in their evangelistic endeavour as Jeffreys did. Few had been as impacted by the Welsh Revival and so, Jeffreys' view notwithstanding, there were numerous articles written in the Elim Evangel discussing the cause and nature of revival, although few direct answers for its apparent absence were offered.¹²³ So whilst Jeffreys was declaring that revival was present, many of his own constituency were attempting to define the concept of revival and explain the necessary pre-conditions in which revival would take place. One of the reasons for this difference in expectation resulted from Jeffreys' understanding of the relationship between revival and successful evangelistic endeavour. He believed that when evangelistic meetings attracted large crowds with people professing conversion this was evidence of revival. This contrasted with the prevailing expectation that revival would be something greater and more embracing than regular evangelistic services. Lancaster explained this differentiation between successful evangelistic campaigns and revival. Revival was

a spontaneous movement of the Spirit of God which transcends organised events and embraces whole communities, even nations, with

¹²³ For example, September 1920, "Revival' in a Theological College"; Finney, C. "The Need of Revival" 15 November 1927, 337-338; Williams, J. "What is a Revival?" 4 July 1930, 425-427; Davis, J. "The Welsh Revival" 9 December 1932, 769-771; Ironside, H.A. "May we expect revival in Britain before the coming of Christ?" 15 March 1935, 168-169, 172; Hardman, J. "Can we expect revival in these days?" 6 January 1941, 8-9, 12; McQuilken, R. "May we expect revival today?" 27 January 1941, 59-60; Kingston, C.J.E. "What kind of revival can we expect?" 12 March 1945; Kingston, C.J.E. "The revival we need" 2 April 1945, 107. Attitudes towards revival have remained somewhat confused. In 1977, Julian Ward, at that time Director of Studies at Elim Bible College, sent a questionnaire to 42 Elim ministers concerning their beliefs. Regarding the source of revival, 16 believed it to be the result of work done by the church, 10 believed it to be a sovereign act of God, 7 believed it to be both and, intriguingly, 8 thought it was neither.

an overwhelming sense of the presence of God, leading to deep conviction of sin and widespread conversions.¹²⁴

He pointed out that the Welsh Revival remained a primary model for Elim's expectations of what could happen in the future.¹²⁵ The significant difference between Jeffreys and the other ministers in Elim was that Jeffreys saw no need to extend one's hopes into the future, he believed he was seeing the same events in his ministry that had been witnessed during the Welsh Revival. Whilst Jeffreys continued to evangelise, declaring revival to be present, churches were acknowledging that they could not produce a revival in their own strength. Their emphasis centred on the preparations that could be made in prayer, so that the church would be 'right with God'. Prayer was a key factor; that more churches had not seen revival was often assumed to be because of a lack of prayer.¹²⁶ This equation of earnest and penitential prayer resulting in revival had survived from nineteenth century Nonconformity.¹²⁷

However, if revival did not happen after prayer had been offered and evangelism undertaken, church members could become discontented. It was assumed that there must be a reason for the delay in revival. The options for

¹²⁴ Letter J. Lancaster to author, 18 January 1994. George Canty confirmed this view, 'Now the idea of revival was not simply getting a lot of souls saved but the way it was done, that is to say that the power of God would descend, preaching would hardly be necessary and a whole area would be moved and people would be convicted.' The model was the spontaneous revivals of the past and the dominant prayer of people was, 'Lord, do it again'. Interview, 24 May 1993, Birmingham.

¹²⁵ Letter J. Lancaster, op. cit.

¹²⁶ Hardman, J.F. "Can we expect a revival in these days?" Elim Evangel 6 January 1941, 8-9, 12.

¹²⁷ Sellars, I. Nineteenth Century Nonconformity (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), 30. Cf. Parsons, G. (Religion in Victorian Britain: Traditions (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 214) 'One of the more self-conscious aspects of the expansive, assertive side of Victorian Christianity was the phenomenon of revivalism and the attempt to sustain, enthuse and invigorate the churches through the promotion of a variety of rituals and ritualised activities and devotional styles.' For a suggested link between the emphasis on prayer at the Keswick Conventions and the Welsh Revival, see Penn-Lewis, J. The Awakening in Wales (London: Overcomer Literature Trust, n.d.), 18.

this delay were limited. Since it was assumed that God wanted the church to be in a state of revival,¹²⁸ either the church was not what it should be or the pastor was somehow inadequate in his ministry.¹²⁹ Whatever the reason for the delay, there was always a possibility that the people could become discouraged. Canty suggested that this failure to see revival materialise ultimately encouraged ministers to concentrate on their pastoral ministry, as opposed to an evangelistic one.¹³⁰ The search for revival was too elusive, whereas, in comparison, the ongoing work of the pastorate was clearly defined.

This was a radical departure from Jeffreys' own understanding that a church that was essentially healthy was already in a state of revival. For the majority of Elim pastors, however, revival had become a technical phrase, and something that, although longed for, was seen to be almost unattainable. Although this difference in the understanding of revival was a comparatively minor issue, it is significant for this thesis since it highlights the fact that Jeffreys' specific background had led him to certain expectations of church life which were not replicated in the majority of churches. So, for example, the impact of this expectation can be seen in Jeffreys' pessimism concerning the

¹²⁸ For example, an editorial in Elim Evangel 1 July 1938, 410, stated, 'No church can be in a healthy state unless it fosters a spirit of revival ... A church should go on in increasing power.'; Hardman (J.F. "Can we expect revival in these days?" Elim Evangel 6 January 1941, 8) wrote, 'We may well ask, where in God's Word are we told that we cannot or will not have another revival in our beloved land?' Kingston (C.J.E. "What kind of revival may we expect" Elim Evangel 12 March 1945, 83) wrote, 'I believe there must, there shall be a revival. Shall God allow His name to be blasphemed, His Son ignored, His grace spurned? No! He must speak.'

¹²⁹ Although prayer was accepted as central for revival, there was also a human element involved. In 1946, Kingston spoke about the need for a 'healthy realism' regarding revival: 'Revival is perhaps other than they have thought in the past - that it is something which costs in the currency of blood and tears and travail - that it is not that which can be secured on easy terms.' Greenway, H.W. "The Elim Conference" Elim Evangel 24 June 1946, 292.

¹³⁰ Canty, Interview, op. cit.

situation in the Irish churches in 1933.¹³¹ In contrast, Philips, who had experienced a more traditional pattern of church life was prepared to be less anxious regarding the tensions within the churches and the lack of consequent growth. Secondly, it is an early example of Jeffreys being prepared to hold to a position which was not universally accepted; indeed, the rest of the Elim churches were prepared to modify Jeffreys' own teachings. Thirdly, it demonstrates that from the earliest period in Elim's history a difference was being discerned in Jeffreys' mind between his ministry and its significance and that of the settled church pastor. When, in future years, Jeffreys began to suggest substantial changes, he would be accused by Phillips of being out of touch with the reality of normal church life.

4. Jeffreys' desire to control spontaneity

Jeffreys' willingness to stand against the prevailing tide of opinion was also evident in his reactions to the spirituality of the Welsh Revival. D.M. Phillips recorded a contemporary report by a journalist, W.T. Stead, of one of the Welsh Revival services,

Three-fourths of the meeting consists of singing. No one uses a hymn book. No one gives out a hymn. The last person to control the meeting in any way is Mr. Evan Roberts. People pray and sing, give testimony; exhort as the Spirit moves them.¹³²

This style of worship continued after the initial social impact of the Revival had waned. Indeed, impressions of Jeffreys' early evangelistic services

¹³¹ For more on the specific problems facing Irish churches in 1933, see the section on Ireland below.

¹³² Phillips, 303. This is confirmed by Hollenweger, (1988) 177, who followed du Bois' eye-witness account, 'The characteristics of the services of the Welsh Revival were the hours-long singing of Welsh hymns in harmony, the decline of the sermon, prayer in concert by the congregation, interruptions from the congregations, an emphasis on the experience of the baptism of the Spirit and the guidance of the Spirit'.

emphasised a similar spontaneity. An eyewitness account of services led by Jeffreys in 1913 stated,

The meetings are left perfectly free and open, and the Holy Spirit just seems to bear us along - prayers, singing and speaking all interspersed. No-one is asked to speak or sing. We all do as we are moved and yet there is no confusion, no extravagance.¹³³

It was this abandonment of ecclesiastical organisation and liturgy that led some of the traditional denominations to set themselves against the new Pentecostal teaching.¹³⁴ However, discomfort at the excesses of early Pentecostal spirituality was not confined to those from traditional churches. Although George Jeffreys' early services had appeared to be spontaneous and free from any control, he reacted against the form of spirituality that stressed spontaneity at the expense of order. In particular, early Elim reports of Jeffreys' conducting of services sought to establish the credibility of Elim by stressing his emphasis on solemnity and orderliness.¹³⁵ The Elim Evangel masthead eventually included the words,

It [Elim] condemns extravagance and fanaticism in every shape and form. It promulgates the old-time Gospel in old-time power.¹³⁶

Jeffreys was clear-sighted in his understanding of the work of the Spirit, and was willing to stand against any emotional excesses. He recognised that the

¹³³ Boddy, A.A. "An Apostolic Welsh Revival" Confidence February 1913, 28. Orr (184) highlighted the similarities between the Welsh Revival and early Pentecostalism: 'Both stressed an unplanned ministry of the Holy Spirit; both were emotionally demonstrative, and both also suffered from a tendency to occasional emotionalism, the exploitation of the emotions to achieve certain feelings.'

¹³⁴ Gee, (1967), 45, 53, 72-75. Carter, J. A Full Life (London: Evangel Press, 1979), 30. Missen, A. The Sound of a Going, (Nottingham: Assemblies of God, 1973), 6. Lavender, F. "New Wine, New Wineskins" Elim Evangel 25 October, 1975, 8.

¹³⁵ Hackett, T.E. "A remedy for Ireland's troubles" Confidence July-September 1918, 53-55; Hare, E.W. "Pentecostal tabernacle at Belfast" Confidence October-December 1919, 59.

¹³⁶ "Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance" Elim Evangel 25 December 1929, 547.

emphasis on emotionalism would not ensure successful evangelism and he became renowned for his commitment to order and dignity. McWhirter wrote an article praising Jeffreys' willingness to confront excesses. He contrasted Jeffreys' policy in Elim with groups that concentrated on 'power', but actually 'seldom got further than "a good time"'.¹³⁷ He claimed that Jeffreys demonstrated that 'sound reason was not incompatible with the exposition of the Full Gospel, nor decency and order with the procedure of services. In fact he rescued the (Pentecostal) Movement from fanaticism'. As a result the Elim Movement had become widely known for its 'sanity, solidity and service'. He concluded his laudatory piece by suggesting that Elim would be acknowledged 'as the part of the Pentecostal Movement that led the way in sobering by doctrine and balancing by practice the greatest evangelising factor of the age'.¹³⁸ The extent to which any of these statements may be accurate is not as important as the fact that this was the image that Elim had of themselves and wished to portray to others at this time. This control of emotionalism during services had been noted earlier by Proctor. In reporting the opening of the Elim Church at Clapham, he claimed that,

Every kind of extravagance, which has marred so many revivals, has been strictly excluded here. Pastor George Jeffreys is a level-headed man, extremely logical and thorough in his discourses, founding all his doctrine upon the "Impregnable Rock" of Holy Writ.¹³⁹

The control that Jeffreys sought to exercise was, in the presence of self-indulgent exotic practices, commendable. However, in the issues over which he later disagreed with Phillips and Elim, this desire for control would cause the fracturing of the denomination. It will be seen that Jeffreys' desire for

¹³⁷ McWhirter, J. "Pentecost" Elim Evangel 2 March 1934, 136.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Proctor, H. "Elim Tabernacle, Clapham" Elim Evangel February 1923, 25.

control became all-embracing, and that the struggle between the Executive Council and Jeffreys was precipitated because of their unwillingness to agree to his continual demands.

Jeffreys responded to spiritual self-indulgence with a desire to see the power of the Holy Spirit re-directed into evangelism, rather than worship. Jeffreys recognised that this reorientation would be needed to stop the new movement petering out into groups merely existing to provide a pleasant pastime for their own members whilst they awaited the rapture.¹⁴⁰ Alexander Boddy praised the Jeffreys brothers' awareness that,

the Lord needs evangelists in Pentecostal work today. There are many teachers and would-be teachers, but few evangelists. The Lord is giving an answer to the criticism that the Pentecostal people are not interested in evangelistic work, and only seek to have good times.¹⁴¹

Hare similarly applauded Jeffreys' focused ministry when he described 'the great prominence which is given to evangelistic work' in Elim. He hoped that 'some of the other [Pentecostal] assemblies [would be moved] to a more definite effort in the direction of soul-winning'.¹⁴² Jeffreys' policy of not allowing esoteric self-indulgence to dominate Elim continued throughout its history.¹⁴³ In particular, a consistently cautious line in Elim was taken against evangelists deemed to be particularly controversial.

¹⁴⁰ Because the prophecy in Joel had referred to the Spirit being poured out in the 'last days', early Pentecostals identified their own experiences as being the precursor to the end. They saw themselves as living in the last of the 'last days'. For example, Jeffreys (T.M. "Sunderland International Pentecostal Congress" Confidence June 1909, 135) wrote, 'I was much impressed with the relation of "the Baptism in the Holy Spirit" to the "coming of the Lord". The Holy Spirit is preparing and adorning the Bride.'

¹⁴¹ Boddy, A.A. "The Welsh Revivalists Visited" Confidence March 1913, 48.

¹⁴² Hare, E.W. "Pentecostal tabernacle at Belfast" Confidence October-December 1919, 59.

¹⁴³ Boulton, E.C.W. George Jeffreys: A Ministry of the Miraculous (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1928), 7.

For example, Elim was unhappy about some of the methods Smith Wigglesworth, a prominent Pentecostal evangelist and healer, employed in his services and for a time would not allow him to minister in the Elim churches because of this. In 1926, Boulton expressed his dismay that Wigglesworth had been invited to the Clapham church. He saw this as a 'breach of the spirit of comradeship which should exist amongst us a band of workers'.¹⁴⁴ The concerns seem to have revolved around Wigglesworth's style of ministry. At times, he required the minister of the church to repeat things he said. Henderson called this practice, 'absolutely tommyrot'.¹⁴⁵ They were also suspicious of his practice of 'wholesale healing',¹⁴⁶ whereby all the sick were asked to stand and lay hands on themselves.¹⁴⁷ At other times, he encouraged 'congregational healing' whereby all would be invited to pray with him for a particular individual 'in order to see the demonstration of God's power'.¹⁴⁸ When he prayed for the sick, he could be very rough; Gee observed, very often he made people run up and down aisles, and even out into the street to "act" faith. His violent laying on of hands would almost send the seekers flying.¹⁴⁹ For acceptance in Elim, all these methods had to be toned down. Henderson wrote, 'We had a real good time but I believe if he is not properly warned (as I did) he would have carried on and frightened the people'.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁴ Letter E.C.W. Boulton to Phillips, 16 February 1926.

¹⁴⁵ Letter W. Henderson to Phillips, 26 December 1928.

¹⁴⁶ Letter W. Henderson to Phillips, 6 December 1928.

¹⁴⁷ Wigglesworth, S. Ever Increasing Faith (Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1971 [1924]), 59.

¹⁴⁸ Frodsham, S.H. Smith Wigglesworth: Apostle of Faith (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1949), 41, 72. Whittaker, C. Seven Pentecostal Pioneers (Basingstoke: Marshalls, 1983), 38.

¹⁴⁹ Gee, D. These men I knew (Nottingham: Assemblies of God Publishing House, 1980), 90-91.

¹⁵⁰ Letter W. Henderson to Phillips, 6 December 1928.

The result of such a policy was that the members of Elim were encouraged to keep their loyalty to George Jeffreys, rather than to allow their support to be given to other notable evangelists. This centring of attention on Jeffreys, which would become a source of dispute in later days,¹⁵¹ was encouraged by both Jeffreys and, unwittingly, by the leaders in Elim. In the early days of Jeffreys' ministry, he appeared to be much safer than many of the other evangelists. This place given to Jeffreys was one that he strove to maintain. He ensured that the Movement was created around his own hugely successful ministry. Throughout the period of the 1920s-1930s, George Jeffreys was the public face of Elim. He was the person that people came to hear, and, for most of this time, was the unifying factor behind the growth of the Movement. However, this meant that the Movement's success was solely dependent on Jeffreys. From the earliest days this was encouraged by Jeffreys. In 1925, when Pastors Tweed, Kingston and Nolan all suggested that they should be involved in healing campaigns, Jeffreys expressed concern about any multiplication of healing ministries. He explained that he was concerned lest the emphasis on healing that numerous healing evangelists would encourage would become detrimental to the work as a whole.¹⁵²

Theologically, Jeffreys defended his reluctance to allow others to be in a similar ministry to his own by differentiating sharply between the ministry of the evangelist and the pastor. He believed that healing was a sign that validated the evangelistic message and was a fulfilment of Mark 16:15-20, open to all,

¹⁵¹ See Appendix 3, Phillips suggested that the ministers of Elim were partly to blame for 'making him the idol of the Elim people'.

¹⁵² Letter Jeffreys to W. Henderson, 7 March 1925.

regardless of belief or moral standing. However, when the evangelist moved on and the ministry of the church began, as distinct from the evangelistic campaign, there were certain conditions applicable to those seeking healing: these included baptism, taking communion and being obedient to the Lord. If these conditions were not complied with, any benefits of healing would be lost.¹⁵³ Therefore, a logical conclusion of this position was that the ministry of the evangelist could not simply be undertaken by the pastor. They had different gifts, different spheres of operation and subsequently different expectations of results. This may have stood behind his refusal to allow others to be involved in the itinerant healing ministry.

However, the more likely possibility is that Jeffreys was anxious lest his own opportunities were damaged by too many Elim evangelists and so his theological understanding of his gifts bolstered his belief in his unique position within the Movement. During 1925, he expressed concern to Phillips that his name had not been placed sufficiently prominently on a revised letter heading. Jeffreys argued that there was nothing 'in the eyes of the public that links me with Elim except as an ordinary worker and any work run on these lines will not succeed'. He felt that since Stephen, his brother, was working against them,¹⁵⁴ 'I must do something to keep my name before the public. In fact, self preservation demands it at present'. He argued that it was God's purpose to build a Movement around 'a channel he chooses' and that future developments

¹⁵³ Jeffreys, (1933) 233-234. Because of the implications of the transition from campaign to church, this needed to be done with discernment, but a 'definite decision' had to be taken to establish a permanent church work.

¹⁵⁴ There is no clear evidence that this is what Stephen was doing.

would see the work being 'built around one man's name. If I do not take steps now to preserve my own work the work with me will suffer'.¹⁵⁵ The task of attempting to interpret motivation is fraught with difficulty. Is this the wisdom of a leader aware of the needs of a new Movement, or, a more likely explanation, the insecurity and vanity of one who feared that he may be eclipsed by others? Phillips came to believe that the latter was the true motivation. In 1941 he told the Irish Ministers that Jeffreys had become obsessed with his exposure to publicity. He claimed that Jeffreys had actively discouraged the development of other evangelists because they might have surpassed Jeffreys' own success.¹⁵⁶

The leaders in Elim had supported Jeffreys' own desire for his prominent position within Elim since this had suited their desire for a cautious approach to be taken in regards to the use of spiritual gifts. However, when the arguments concerning his demands for changes in church government became prominent, the fact that he had received sole publicity within Elim resulted in the leaders' suspicion that he would use his influence with the people to sway them to support his own views on British Israelism.

The paradox within Jeffreys' personality that will emerge in the later disagreements can be discerned here. Jeffreys had experienced the lack of clerical control and had understood that the established clergy had, on the

¹⁵⁵ Letter Jeffreys to Phillips. Undated but in the light of the reference to Stephen's opposition it would seem that the letter was sent around the end of 1925, or at the latest the beginning of 1926.

¹⁵⁶ Appendix 3.

whole, rejected the work that God was doing amongst the 'Children of the Revival'. He had been part of the reaction against traditional church structures and clerical authority. His own ministry had emerged from the spontaneity and he had been encouraged by this freedom to develop a self-belief in his gifts. However, Jeffreys desired to be in control of this spontaneity himself. In brief, Jeffreys desired spontaneity if he was to be the beneficiary of this freedom though desired to be in control if he felt threatened by it.

5. Conclusion

The significance of the Welsh Revival to this thesis is that during this early period of Elim's history some of the seeds of troubles that later would grow to fruition can be perceived. Whilst the Welsh Revival provided the lasting imagery of future revivals and dominated the future expectations of ministers and churches, Jeffreys claimed that he was continuing within the tradition of the Revival. For him revival was not a future hope, but a present reality. Jeffreys saw himself as different from the other ministers who were merely hoping and praying for revival. He actively encouraged this distinction. This would enable him to claim unique authority in the arguments that would emerge in later days. However, his belief that all churches should be continually experiencing revival, caused him frustration when they did not. The fact that there was an absence of revival also caused pastors great frustration; consequently, many concentrated on the pastoral aspect of their ministry rather than the apparent non-productive evangelistic ministry. The expectations of ministers were therefore radically different from Jeffreys and the Revival Party. It will be seen

that ultimately this led to a distancing between Jeffreys and the body of Ministers which was exacerbated when Jeffreys suggested changes in church government procedures.

The paternalistic attitude of the leaders in Elim in guarding the laity from the claims and practices of other charismatic preachers highlighted the significance of Jeffreys who was able to retain the sole position as the Movement's charismatic leader. They contributed to the problems in the future by praising the control that Jeffreys maintained over his services and churches in the face of total spontaneity. However, when Jeffreys desired to extend this control away from services to structures, the discription of the Movement began.

2 Divergent views concerning the person and work of the Holy Spirit.

The following section deals with the development of pneumatology within Pentecostalism. British Pentecostalism was specifically influenced by the theology of the Keswick Convention and so in outlining this development, it is from this base that the development is viewed. The examination of Jeffreys' theological understanding of the person and work of the Spirit is of particular importance to this thesis. On certain issues he was part of the developing theology to which the majority within Elim adhered; in other matters he was willing to hold to minority positions. Once again, illustrated here is evidence of his individualism. This would become particularly significant in the explicit disagreements between Jeffreys and Elim.

1. The significance of the Keswick Convention to early Pentecostalism.

The significance of the teaching presented at the Keswick Convention on early twentieth century evangelicalism generally and on the Pentecostal Movement particularly is well documented.¹⁵⁷ It was popular and influential because of the promises it made. It recognised that Christians wanted lives that were meaningful and that most Christians felt that they failed to live up to the

¹⁵⁷ Bebbington, D. Evangelicalism in Modern Britain (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 151-228; Kent, J. Holding the Fort (London: Epworth, 1978), 33ff, 295ff; Barabas, S. So Great a Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1952); Pollock, J.C. The Keswick Story (London: Hodder, 1964); Lederle, H.I. Treasures Old and New (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988), 11-15; Packer, J.I. Keep in Step with the Spirit (Leicester: IVP, 1988²), 145-164; Menzies, W.M. "The Non-Wesleyan Origins of the Pentecostal Movement" in Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins, Synan, V. (ed) (Plainfield: Logos, 1975), 83-98; Warfield, B.B. Studies in Perfectionism vol. 2, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1931), 463-611.

standards that God expected of them. The solution offered by Keswick was an enduement of power to live a life of victory; a 'fuller deliverance from sin and closer fellowship with Christ than any yet experienced'.¹⁵⁸ This blessing was the fullness of the Spirit, received through an act of faith subsequent to conversion.¹⁵⁹

According to this theology, every Christian received the Holy Spirit at regeneration, but not every Christian had received the fullness of the Spirit.¹⁶⁰ To attempt to act as a Christian without this fullness was futile, since without this experience it was impossible to live a normal Christian life.¹⁶¹ Entrance to this blessing was open to all believers, but unless one specifically sought a secondary experience one was doomed to live a deficient Christian life. To be filled with the Spirit meant that one would be controlled and guided by the Spirit.¹⁶² The experience was received by an act of faith, a step that must be trusted to be efficacious regardless of whether one's emotions were affected or not.¹⁶³

Those involved with the early Pentecostal Movement were often those who had previously been regular visitors to the Keswick Convention.¹⁶⁴ Alexander Boddy had been one of the first to recognise the short step between the

¹⁵⁸ Packer, 145.

¹⁵⁹ Lederle, 13.

¹⁶⁰ Barabas, 35-36, 131-132.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 133.

¹⁶² Ibid., 132, 145.

¹⁶³ Torrey, R.A. "How to receive the Holy Ghost" in Stevenson, H.F. Keswick's Triumphant Voice: 48 Outstanding Addresses delivered at the Keswick Convention, 1882-1962 (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1963), 359.

¹⁶⁴ Boddy, A.A. "At Keswick" Confidence, August 1908, 13.

teaching of Keswick, of yielding oneself to the fullness of the Spirit and then being empowered for service, and the Pentecostal teaching of a subsequent experience of the Holy Spirit. He appreciated the impact that Keswick had made upon his own ministry,¹⁶⁵ and cited Keswick as one of the formative spiritual influences upon him.¹⁶⁶ The benefits testified to by the Pentecostals, such as victory over sin, power for living and an enhanced prayer life were the same as had been promised at Keswick. In Elim, many looked back on their experiences of attending the Keswick Conventions and the spiritual blessings they received there as being part of their spiritual pilgrimage towards Pentecostalism. For example, Miss Barbour, an early Elim missionary, testified that she had assumed she had received the baptism in the Spirit 'as I had had a wonderful blessing at Keswick'. However, when she had a subsequent Pentecostal experience, she re-evaluated her previous belief about the blessings she had received at Keswick as being notably less significant than her Pentecostal experience.¹⁶⁷ Similarly, Corry, Dean of the Elim Bible College from 1927-1938, had been baptised in the Spirit after having been a member of a prayer and Bible study group that had met in Preston. He had previously been a regular visitor to Keswick, but had found that the Convention had been unable to help him adequately develop his prayer life, which had only changed

¹⁶⁵ Boddy, Jane Vazeille, Alexander Alfred Boddy 1854-1930 (TMs) 1.

¹⁶⁶ 'I was associated with Mr Reader Harris, for a time, and was much helped. Keswick was also a help to me.' North Star 24 May 1915, 2 in Robinson, M. The Life and Ministry of A.A. Boddy (TMs) 16.

¹⁶⁷ Barbour, M. "A Mighty Enduement" Elim Evangel 19 June 1936, 394. This experience was repeated in the personal histories of, amongst others, J.T. Bradley (Letter J.T. Bradley to author, 12 May 1993) and W.F.P. Burton ("My testimony to the Baptism in the Holy Spirit" Redemption Tidings April 1930, 3-4).

after he was baptised in the Spirit, in the Pentecostal understanding of that phrase.¹⁶⁸

Although the Elim Evangel never carried any advertisements for the Convention, occasionally it did refer to it in a positive light.¹⁶⁹ However, it was with the caveat that it had not accepted the full teaching of Pentecost. In 1929, whilst the Convention was described in an editorial in the Elim Evangel as 'one of the greatest spiritual tonics to the Church of Christ',¹⁷⁰ it was lamented that the emphasis on the Spirit was,

vaguer ... than Foursquare Christians are used to. We, however, pray that the Convention will be so swept by the power of the Spirit that many will be compelled to say, "Why, the Foursquare people were right after all".¹⁷¹

2. Jeffreys' experience of the Holy Spirit

In 1910, Jeffreys experienced the baptism in the Spirit and spoke in tongues. The precise details surrounding this experience are blurred. Although Jeffreys gave his own account of his major spiritual experiences in 1929,¹⁷² there are a number of distinct accounts of the details surrounding his reception of the baptism in the Spirit. The article in 1929 referred to his conversion under the ministry of Rev. Glasnant Jones, his baptism in the river in the Llynvi Valley and his healing whilst at prayer in the Duffryn Chapel. It is interesting to note

¹⁶⁸ Corry (P.N.C. "Baptised into Reality", Elim Evangel 19 June 1936, 391) was baptised in the Spirit at a prayer group led by Thomas Myerscough in Preston on 3 February 1910. The influence of Thomas Myerscough on Elim's early leaders should be noted. Corry, Jeffreys, Phillips, Darragh had all been taught by Myerscough.

¹⁶⁹ As part of the editorial in the Elim Evangel 15 August 1930, 520, an excerpt of Graham Scroggie's testimony was included with an extended news report of the services.

¹⁷⁰ Editorial, Elim Evangel 12 July 1929, 168.

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Jeffreys, G. "Christmas and New Year's Greetings" Elim Evangel, 25 December 1929, 529-530.

that in Jeffreys' account there is no reference to the baptism in the Spirit, which seems to have occurred before he was baptised in water. This is strange considering the significance that Jeffreys attached to this experience for Christians generally.

In describing Jeffreys' early life, Gee emphasised his links with Boddy's church in Sunderland.¹⁷³ One of the small groups of 'Children of the Revival' was formed from members of the English Congregational Church, Waunllwyd, Ebbw Vale. This was the church of which Thomas Madog Jeffreys¹⁷⁴ was the minister. In November 1907, Moncur Niblock visited the group and spoke of the Pentecostal outpouring that had been occurring throughout the world. At that time he had not received this experience himself, though was convinced of its veracity and went to Sunderland to learn more. He returned to Waunllwyd and, on 22 December 1907, the minister, T.M. Jeffreys, was baptised in the Spirit. On Easter Tuesday, 1908, four members of a small group from Dowlais visited Waunllwyd, were baptised in the Spirit and returned to Dowlais. One of these four was Price Davis, who visited the group of which Stephen and George were members. According to Gee, they were then baptised in the Spirit.¹⁷⁵ This happened in the Duffryn Chapel in 1910.¹⁷⁶

An alternative account highlights the part played by Edward Jeffreys, Stephen's son. According to this account given by Edward, he was the first member of the

¹⁷³ Gee, (1967), 35-37. One of the frustrating aspects of Gee's work is that he does not give any indication of his sources.

¹⁷⁴ T.M. Jeffreys was no relation to George.

¹⁷⁵ Gee, (1967), 34. Whittaker (49) follows the same story.

¹⁷⁶ Cartwright, 24.

family to be baptised in the Spirit. In 1909, aged 10 years, he went to Crosshands in Wales and, after being prayed for, spoke in tongues. After returning home, one of the men who had been at the meetings explained to Edward's parents exactly what had happened. Edward commented, 'This made my father and mother, also an uncle of mine,¹⁷⁷ think very seriously concerning this wonderful blessing'. As a result of this, 'they were all eventually baptised according to Acts 2:4'.¹⁷⁸

This account differs slightly from one that appeared in Confidence. Hackett¹⁷⁹ recounted how, after becoming convinced of the veracity of the baptism in the Spirit, Stephen and George prayed together, asking God to baptise them in the Spirit. However, to their surprise Edward, aged nine,¹⁸⁰ with no prior experience or evident knowledge of the glossalalia, began to speak in tongues, 'and followed at great length in Welsh with a wonderful and quite unwonted use of Scripture'. A few days later, on a Sunday morning, George began to sing in tongues.¹⁸¹ Although it was assumed that this must have happened in Wales, this is not stated explicitly.

¹⁷⁷ Considering the other accounts that follow a generally similar scheme, there can be no doubt that George was the 'uncle'.

¹⁷⁸ Jeffreys, E. Bethel Messenger, December 1931, 187.

¹⁷⁹ Rev. Thomas Hackett, a Church of Ireland minister in Bray, was one of the members of the Advisory Council. This article was an authorised article, appealing for funds. It was written from Elim Headquarters, then situated at 3 University Avenue, Belfast. It can be assumed, therefore, that the details of the story came from Jeffreys himself. Cartwright (24) assumes this.

¹⁸⁰ This contrasts with the age that Edward Jeffreys gave.

¹⁸¹ Hackett, T.E. "Pentecostal Meetings in Belfast" Confidence April-June 1918, 19-21.

Cartwright, whilst accepting Jeffreys' own account, was aware of a letter sent by Jeffreys to William Hutchinson. Hutchinson was the founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement, the first British Pentecostal denomination. Jeffreys wrote,

Since I have been at Bournemouth, [Hutchinson's church] "All things are become new - Old things have passed away". Hallelujah! I have been saved, sanctified, baptised in the Holy Ghost (with the scriptural sign of tongues) and healed of sickness. This is the Lord's doing and Marvellous in our eyes ... I have the gift of "tongues and interpretation" but the latter gift must still be developed. I cannot tell you all he has done for me...Now comes my testing time. I am going home to Wales, and this is but the beginning of a mighty battle.¹⁸²

This might indicate that these events either occurred at Bournemouth, or, as Cartwright suggested, prior to his visit, with any confusion regarding the chronology of the events merely being the result of his careless expression.¹⁸³

Hathaway, however, argued that Jeffreys experienced these events in Bournemouth, whilst on a visit to Hutchinson's church.¹⁸⁴ This has to be acknowledged as the most natural reading of the letter. This link with the Apostolic Faith Church would also be confirmed by the fact that the wife of James Brookes, the Apostolic Faith pastor of the Belle View Church, Swansea, recalled that Jeffreys attended their Saturday night services regularly.¹⁸⁵

Hathaway argued that due to the increasingly bizarre doctrinal positions held by Hutchinson and the Apostolic Faith Church and the general ignominy of the group, it is understandable that Jeffreys should not have acknowledged any

¹⁸² Cartwright, (1986), 26. The letter was published in Showers of Blessing 5:5.

¹⁸³ Cartwright, in Telephone Conversation, 11 June 1997.

¹⁸⁴ Hathaway, M. "The role of William Oliver Hutchinson and the Apostolic Faith Church in the formation of British Pentecostal Churches." EPTA Bulletin 16, 1996, 40-57. This article was written by Malcolm Hathaway, the grandson of W.G. Hathaway.

¹⁸⁵ Cartwright, D. "Echoes from the Past" Elim Evangel 22 January 1983, 6. Brookes was the first pastor sent by Hutchinson to Swansea. Brookes had joined the Apostolic Faith Church in 1910. Llewellyn, H.B. A Study in the History and Thought of the Apostolic Church in Wales in the Context of Pentecostalism (M.Phil. diss. University of Bangor, 1997), 30.

link with Hutchinson.¹⁸⁶ In fact, at the time of Jeffreys' Spirit-baptism, the Apostolic churches were viewed as models of order. Myerscough, writing to Hutchinson in 1910, commenting on his own church in Preston, felt that 'the order and the comfort of the Assembly makes one feel as if they were in one of the Apostolic Churches'.¹⁸⁷ However, in the light of their future developments, it would explain why Jeffreys himself shed little light on the dating of his early experiences.

The only certain fact we have regarding Jeffreys' Christian experiences is that he was baptised in water on 2 April 1911,¹⁸⁸ interestingly after he had been baptised in the Spirit and six years after his initial conversion experience. At this distance, and with so little direct evidence, it is probably impossible to determine exactly the chronology of these spiritual experiences. There are three possibilities: firstly, most of his experiences did happen in Wales, and the letter is, as Cartwright suggested, careless. Secondly, in writing to Hutchinson, Jeffreys overemphasised the significance of his visit to Bournemouth; Jeffreys was 21 years old in 1910, and may have been eager to inculcate a relationship with Hutchinson, who had recently established the first Pentecostal church in England. The third option follows Hathaway's suggestion and recognises that Jeffreys felt the need to re-configure the story of his early experiences so as not to be accused of heterodoxy. This would seem to be the most natural way of reading the accounts and would be consistent with other evidence regarding

¹⁸⁶ Hathaway, M., op. cit., 52.

¹⁸⁷ Letter T. Myerscough to W. Hutchinson, 26 September 1910, reprinted in Showers of Blessing August/September 1910, 1-2.

¹⁸⁸ Letter Cartwright to author, 13 January 1997. He pointed out that he previously had misquoted the date (Cartwright, 27).

Jeffreys, namely that he was very conscious of the vulnerability of his public image and the need to be constantly aware of the possibility of attack.¹⁸⁹ For Jeffreys, conscious of his evangelistic ministry, any attack that could conceivably detract attention from the purpose of evangelism was to be actively resisted. In this case, if that entailed him obscuring his own past, then he was willing to do so.

The healing that he referred to in the letter to Hutchinson was of a facial paralysis and a speech impediment from which he had suffered since birth. He later testified that whilst praying with his family one Sunday morning, he 'received such an inflow of Divine life that I can only liken the experience to being charged with electric. It seemed as if my head were connected to a most powerful electric battery'.¹⁹⁰ As he retold the story in later years this healing was invested with more importance than mere relief from physical incapacity. The healing was described as a deliverance from an early death by means of which God had shown him the direction he was to take in his future life. The reason he had been given this clarity of speech was to preach the gospel.¹⁹¹

In contrast, information on Phillips' experience of the Spirit is very slight. He testified that he experienced the baptism in the Spirit on 31 January 1909. He

¹⁸⁹ See below for more material on this aspect of his character.

¹⁹⁰ Jeffreys, (1932), 57. The comparison of the power of the Holy Spirit and electricity was a common one in Pentecostal circles. Barratt wrote in 1907, 'maybe the body will tremble and quake as the Spirit lets its power break into it, as it shakes and twists when electricity is introduced.' Bloch-Hoell, 137. Semple McPherson likened her experience of physical trembling when she was baptised in the Spirit to the experiments she had made with electricity at school when, 'the laboratory at college hummed and shook under the power of electricity.' Bloch-Hoell, 137.

¹⁹¹ Landau, 134. The severity of the ailment was emphasised, Jeffreys claimed, 'I knew that unless a miracle was wrought in me, life was to be very short'. 133.

did not detail how this took place, simply referring to it as producing a 'more radical change than conversion'.¹⁹² Although this may seem to be a surprising comment, implying that he undervalued his conversion experience, it was in fact how Phillips viewed the two events. He had become a Christian at such a young age that any change in lifestyle was negligible. The baptism in the Spirit, occurring at the age of 16, was experienced as empowering for a young man to live a fully consecrated life for God. Although the baptism in the Spirit was central to the expectations of Christian experience for Jeffreys and Phillips, it is significant that the events surrounding Jeffreys' reception of the Spirit were so obscured. In detailing his own testimony he refused to acknowledge the true story of his own life, believing it possible that he would be misunderstood. It is possible that Jeffreys would have been misunderstood if he had told the truth about his experience. He was unwilling to take this risk and so was willing to subdue parts of his own experience if he felt that to be necessary.

3. The Spirit's work in regeneration

Theologically, Keswick teachers believed that the Spirit was involved in the work of regeneration, but that the second stage of the Christian life happened not as the Christian received more of the Spirit, but rather as the Spirit received more of the believer.¹⁹³ This understanding allowed for the Spirit to be involved in the initial work of regeneration and yet also emphasised the necessity of a secondary work of grace. Christians were consequently divided into two

¹⁹² Phillips, E.J. "A Spiritual Revolution" Elim Evangel 19 June 1936, 396. This phrase was repeated by Gorman, S. "Personality Spotlight", Elim Evangel 25 December 1957, 810.

¹⁹³ Barabas, 132, 145.

groups; those who were living a victorious life, and those who were not.¹⁹⁴

Those living a victorious Christian life had defeated their tendency to sin.¹⁹⁵

For the Pentecostals, the schema of salvation was similar. When one was baptised with the Spirit, the Spirit took up residence in the believer's life.

Although Pentecostals did not readily confront the central problem regarding the part they believed the Spirit had played in their pre-Pentecostal experience,

Barratt's position was close to the beliefs held generally. He held that the Spirit was received at conversion, and led people to an awareness of scripture, giving a revelation of Jesus, the regenerator of salvation, and the witness

thereof. However, this was 'merely the commencement of the spiritual life'.¹⁹⁶

The baptism of the Spirit was the occasion when the Holy Spirit takes full possession of the believer, and was the 'fuller and more powerful reign of God within and through us'.¹⁹⁷

Jeffreys held to an unusual understanding of the relationship between the Spirit of Jesus and the Holy Spirit, that, he believed, explained the possibility of someone being a Christian, and yet not being baptised in the Spirit. He

¹⁹⁴ Andrew Murray taught that there were two distinct groups of Christians, those who had received the Spirit, and those who had not, the 'carnal' Christians. Murray, A. "The Carnal Christian" in Stevenson, (1963), 92.

¹⁹⁵ Two analogies were regularly used. The sinful nature was seen as an uninflated balloon attached to a cart (sin). When Christ fills the balloon, the resulting buoyancy overcomes sin. The tendency to sin would have been overcome, since Christ fills one's life, even though one may still be liable to sin. Hopkins, E.H. The Life of Faith February 1885, 21 quoted in Marsden, G.M. Fundamentalism and American Culture (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 78. The other favoured analogy was of a life-belt being thrown to a man drowning at sea. The life-belt counteracts the natural element of gravity, and so the man will not drown. If he lets go, though, he will. Hopkins, E.H. "The Threefold Deliverance" in Stevenson, H.F. Keswick's Authentic Voice: 65 Dynamic Addresses delivered at the Keswick Convention, 1875-1957 (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1959), 166.

¹⁹⁶ Barratt, T.B. "The Baptism of the Holy Ghost - what is it?" Confidence October 1909, 221.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 222

argued that the difference between the two states was due to 'the difference between the Spirit of Christ and the Holy Spirit'.¹⁹⁸ He argued that at regeneration, believers receive the Spirit of Christ. Therefore, they have a relationship with the Father and are able to exhibit the fruit of the Spirit. However, the gifts of the Spirit, and a life lived in power, can only be enjoyed by one who has been baptised in the Holy Spirit. According to Jeffreys, this Holy Spirit is to be differentiated from the Spirit of Christ.¹⁹⁹ The argument was developed by comparing John 7:37-39²⁰⁰ with John 1:12-13.²⁰¹ On the basis that any who received Jesus were automatically children of God, he argued that the disciples must have been regenerated believers prior to Pentecost.²⁰² He suggested that their separation from the world, their ability to bear fruit, evangelise, pray and share fellowship with Christ all pointed to the fact that they were converted. In a rhetorical flourish he wrote,

Are we to suppose for a moment that the disciples, who were our Lord's friends and companions, were unregenerate persons? Are we to conclude that the first breaking of bread service was celebrated by unregenerate disciples? Speaking reverently are we to believe that the Holy Virgin, who was privileged to bring into the world the offspring of God and the Saviour of mankind, was unregenerate? No! No!²⁰³

¹⁹⁸ Jeffreys, G. "A Striking Analogy" Elim Evangel 16 February 1925, 37. For Jeffreys, Romans 8:9 was a significant component of his argument: 'You, however, are controlled not by the sinful nature but by the Spirit, if the Spirit of God lives in you. And if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Christ.'

¹⁹⁹ Jeffreys, (1933), 39. This chapter had appeared in the Elim Evangel 16 March 1925, 61ff, "The Spirit of Christ and the Holy Spirit"; it was subtitled "an address by Pastor George Jeffreys". This was one of Jeffreys' regular sermons that he preached, see poster publicising the opening of Elim Tabernacle, Clapham, Tuesday 28 November 1922, "The Spirit of Christ and the Holy Spirit - is there a difference?" Regents Theological College archive.

²⁰⁰ In particular, stressing the final part that John explained as referring to the Spirit, who had not yet been given, because Jesus had not been glorified.

²⁰¹ 'But as many as received Him to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.'

²⁰² Jeffreys, (1933), 42, 52.

²⁰³ Ibid., 49.

Therefore, if they were believers and yet not baptised in the Spirit, it was possible for contemporary Christians to have received Jesus as saviour, i.e. the Spirit of Christ, and yet not have received the Holy Spirit. He stated forthrightly, 'What Christians receive at regeneration is the Spirit of Christ'.²⁰⁴

This view was held by Jeffreys at least as early as 1917, when a report appeared in Confidence of a sermon that he had preached on Romans 8.²⁰⁵

The most obvious source for this teaching is Thomas Myerscough.²⁰⁶ In 1923, Myerscough was invited to publish a series of Bible studies on Romans in the Elim Evangel. The eighteenth study was entitled, "The Holy Spirit and the Spirit of Christ".²⁰⁷ The article argued that there were two distinct experiences that Christians needed, one was the new birth, the reception of the Spirit of Jesus; the second was the reception of 'another' comforter, the Spirit of God. He taught that the Spirit of Christ functions as the one who gives eternal life, whereas the Holy Spirit convicts the unconverted. The work of the Spirit is to guide people into truth, teach and operate as the source of power. So to receive 'the Son of God is said to be a spirit-birth, but the receiving of the Holy

²⁰⁴ Ibid., 49-50.

²⁰⁵ Darragh, R.E. "The Ballymena Convention" Confidence March-April 1917, 20.

²⁰⁶ Thomas Myerscough lived from 1858-1932. Converted in 1874, he became an estate agent in Preston, but his legacy was the people he affected through his Bible study group that met weekly, and then through his role as leader of the Pentecostal Missionary Union Bible School (1911-14). Among his students were George Jeffreys, William Burton, James Salter and E.J. Phillips. His influence on Jeffreys was an accepted fact amongst Jeffreys' contemporaries. Pastor J.C. Kennedy (Interview, 22 April 1993) pointed to the similarities between Jeffreys' teachings and that of Myerscough. Bradley (Letter to author, 12 May 1993) likewise indicated the relationship between Jeffreys and Myerscough. Cartwright (Letter to author, 3 July 1995) agrees with this supposition. Myerscough was a member of the council of the Pentecostal Missionary Union and a founding member of the Assemblies of God, sitting on the Executive Council from 1924. Gee (1980), 67-69. Nelson Parr, J. "Homecall of Mr Thomas Myerscough" Redemption Tidings April 1932, 2.

²⁰⁷ Myerscough, T. "The Epistle to the Assembly at Rome: The Holy Spirit and the Spirit of Christ" Elim Evangel July 1924, 156-160.

Ghost is said to be God's witness to their having received Christ'.²⁰⁸ At times this teaching became very abstruse. Jeffreys simplified the basic teaching and for a period it found some adherents because of Jeffreys' influence.²⁰⁹ For example, Parker, in his booklet, The Baptism in the Holy Spirit, explained that he had been convinced by Jeffreys' teaching concerning this particular understanding of the Spirit.²¹⁰ Similarly, James T. Bradley has held to this teaching all through his ministry after being convinced by Jeffreys' arguments. He accepted that this put him in a minority within the Elim Movement and caused him to be misunderstood. He was the Dean of the Bible College and so the teaching was disseminated to a wide audience of future ministers, although not all accepted this teaching. In later days, because he had so often been misquoted, he decided to stop propagating the viewpoint.²¹¹ In defence of Myerscough, and subsequently Jeffreys, it has to be acknowledged that they were taking seriously the fact that they had experienced a new birth, prior to a subsequent revolutionary experience. They attempted to make theological sense of both experiences albeit with limited exegetical tools. Although generally their views were not accepted, there were no alternative theological views put forward.²¹² Lancaster's summary of the general teaching in Elim

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 160.

²⁰⁹ For example, Joseph Smith "What is the difference between the Holy Spirit and the Spirit of Christ?" Elim Evangel 22 April 1938, 256; Lees, J. "Another Comforter" Elim Evangel 19 July 1929, 180-181. Canty (G., Letter to K. Warrington, 25 November 1996) recalls that he was taught this theory when he was at the Bible College, although the students reacted against this teaching. Petts (Bush, T. "The development of the perception of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit within the Pentecostal movement in Great Britain." EPTA Bulletin 10:1&2, 1992, 38, n 57) suggests that the teaching is still held by some older Assemblies of God ministers .

²¹⁰ Parker, P.G., The Baptism in the Holy Spirit (London: Elim Publishing Co., n.d.), preface.

²¹¹ Bradley, J.T., Letter to author, 12 May 1993.

²¹² Recently the only academic theological piece of work on the baptism of the Spirit produced within Elim has been by William Atkinson, "Pentecostal response to Dunn's *Baptism in the Spirit: Luke-Acts*" Journal of Pentecostal Theology 6 1995, 87-131;

regarding the ongoing work of the Spirit is that one receives a certain amount of the presence of the Spirit when one is converted which increases as one opens oneself up to Him.²¹³

4. The relationship between sanctification and the reception of the Spirit

Early Pentecostal teaching was reminiscent of that found within the Holiness Movement. There was an emphasis upon 'yielding' as being a necessary preparation for the subsequent experience of being filled with the Spirit.²¹⁴

According to this teaching, 'the baptism of fire' could only be received by people with clean hearts. Then, Barratt declared, 'love will burn within, and tongues burst forth'.²¹⁵ This process did not necessarily need to be a lengthy one. If done with 'simplicity and perfect consecration', one's baptism in the Spirit could be very closely linked, temporally, to regeneration.²¹⁶

In the Elim Evangel some articles showed that this three-stage understanding of the Christian life was being taught in early Elim circles. Kortkamp outlined the conditions for receiving the baptism of the Spirit as being repentance and water baptism, consecration, prayer and praise since one had to believe that

"Pentecostal response to Dunn's *Baptism in the Spirit: Pauline Letters*" Journal of Pentecostal Theology 7 1995, 49-72.

²¹³ Lancaster, J. Interview 20 April 1993. For example, Boulton (E.C.W., "The manifold ministry of the Holy Ghost" Elim Evangel 12 June 1944, 189) wrote, 'As we yield to the Holy Ghost how graciously He takes possession, melting us down, until we are in a condition to flow into the mould of all God's perfect will.... The struggle (to make Christ King) is over.'

²¹⁴ Boddy, A.A. "Editor's Report of the First Meeting on Second Day." Confidence August 1909, 179. The concept of yielding had been used previously. In Confidence November 1908, 24, there was a description of yielding to God being a means to receiving the Spirit.

²¹⁵ Barratt, T.B. In the Days of Latter Rain (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1928), 70.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 72.

God had heard one's prayer.²¹⁷ The need for consecration, as a prior condition to being filled with the Spirit, was stressed by Tweed who suggested that one had to be 'emptied of self, that you may be filled with God'.²¹⁸ Adelaide Henderson, one of the earliest Elim workers,²¹⁹ described her own experience of attending one of Jeffreys' early meetings. She was a Christian, but during the service 'laid everything on the altar for God'; she then began to speak in tongues as she was baptised in the Spirit.²²⁰

This development was evident in Gee's writings; the conditions he set out for claimants of the Spirit were repentance, obedience marked by having been baptised, appropriation of the promises and tarrying until one could 'let go and let God'.²²¹ The emphasis that Keswick had placed upon full obedience being practised prior to being filled with the Spirit was replaced in Gee's scheme with the necessity of water baptism. Writing after Gee, Jeffreys followed this schema. His teaching about the Christian life stressed the three necessary experiences of regeneration, obedience as illustrated in water baptism and the reception of the baptism of the Spirit.²²² Jeffreys reacted against the holiness

²¹⁷ Kortkamp, A.W. "A Bible Study on the Baptism of the Spirit" Elim Evangel August 1922, 128.

²¹⁸ Tweed, R. "The Personality and Baptism of the Holy Spirit" Elim Evangel 2 March 1934, 140. Cf. the holiness teaching: Warfield, 541, 543; Marsden, G.M., 78; Barabas S., 132, 145; Hopkins, (E.H. The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, n.d.), 88, 122f) wrote, 'A "perfect" heart is a heart wholly yielded to God., and 'Instead of seeking to have more of the Holy Spirit we should yield ourselves to Him, that He might have more of us.' Stevenson (1963, 20) said that there was no 'authoritative and comprehensive statement of Keswick doctrine, except perhaps The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life'.

²¹⁹ She joined the Elim Evangelistic Band on 8 October 1920. She died on 31 March 1990.

²²⁰ Henderson, A. "Possessed and Permeated by God" Elim Evangel 19 June 1936, 391.

²²¹ Gee, D. "To Seekers after the Baptism in the Holy Ghost", April 1923, 64-66, a continuation article appeared the following month, 87-89. This article was reprinted in the Elim Evangel 18 April 1970, 260-261.

²²² Jeffreys, (1933), 68, 104.

teaching's stress on sanctification,²²³ believing that Christ's death accomplished all that was necessary to live a holy life.²²⁴ The secondary experience of the Spirit did not provide holiness, but did enable believers to live powerful Christian lives. So, whilst the link with the earlier Holiness teachers was still maintained it had become modified.

The teaching in Elim continued to develop away from the Keswick understanding of the conditions of receiving the Spirit. In 1933, Hathaway stressed that the Spirit, normally received subsequent to regeneration and water baptism, was the sanctifying agent,²²⁵ and was given to those who had purified themselves and so were worthy of receiving the Spirit. The baptism of the Spirit was open to all 'believers of every grade of spirituality'.²²⁶ They would be sanctified after they had received the Spirit. By 1976, Lancaster declared the accepted position openly, 'Holiness is not a condition of the baptism in the Spirit'.²²⁷

It can be seen that Jeffreys was part of this developing theology, moving from a three-stage understanding of Christian initiation, into the two-stage

²²³ Bradley (J.T. Letter to author, 12 May 1993) stated, 'George did not hesitate to attack the then prevalent "holiness" and "second blessing" teaching. I recall him saying, "Reckon yourself to be dead to sin."'

²²⁴ Entire sanctification happened by one giving one's body to Jesus Christ. 'When a man receives the Lord Jesus Christ his body comes under new management, new government.' At the point of conversion a person's 'standing and state' change, and they can 'become the possessor of the very life of Christ'. Jeffreys, G. "Sanctification: Conclusion of a sermon preached at the City Temple, London" Elim Evangel 19 October 1934, 656.

²²⁵ Hathaway, W.G. Spiritual Gifts in the Church (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1933), 101.

²²⁶ Bradley, J.T. (ed) Elim Lay Preacher's Handbook (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1946), 50.

²²⁷ Lancaster, J. The Spirit Filled Church (Cheltenham: Grenehurst Press, 1976), 28.

understanding of classical Pentecostalism. However, in his distinction between the Spirit of Christ and the Holy Spirit, he held to a distinct minority viewpoint. That others did not adhere to his beliefs did not concern Jeffreys. His primary concern was to explain the work of the Spirit pragmatically. The theological tenets that he developed explained what had already happened. Once again, it can be seen that Jeffreys was content to hold to a minority viewpoint, at odds with his own constituency, when the viewpoint upheld his own experience.

5. The sign of being filled with the Spirit

If the goal of Keswick and the Pentecostals was similar, that is, the search for holiness and power for service, there was a fundamental difference for the Pentecostals; they had a sign by which they could be assured that they had received a specific spiritual blessing, the sign of tongues. The teaching of Keswick had explained that the fullness of the Spirit was received by a definite act of faith,²²⁸ which should not depend upon one's feelings.²²⁹ Jeffreys expressed the frustration experienced by many at this teaching,

From one Christian Convention to another we went, always longing for an experience that would satisfy, and in each we were asked to receive in the same way.²³⁰

Murray's call for Christians to believe that they had received the Spirit even though there was 'no new experience, and no feeling, and no excitement, and no light, but apparently darkness',²³¹ did not leave many feeling assured that

²²⁸ This 'definite step of faith within the soul' may have taken place in an after meeting where testimonies would be shared by those who had 'passed from a lower to a higher stage of experience in the Christian life'. Cummings, E.J. "What we Teach" in Stevenson, (1963), 25. See also, Barabas, 49, 134

²²⁹ Hopkins, E.H. "The Fullness of the Spirit" in Stevenson, (1959), 465.

²³⁰ Jeffreys, G. The Miraculous Foursquare Gospel, Vol. 1: Doctrinal (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1929), 46.

²³¹ Murray, A. "The Carnal Christian" in Stevenson, (1963), 93.

they had experienced real spiritual blessing. Equally, the evidence of this experience as taught by Keswick teachers, that is, that Christians would receive peace, or be at rest, be able to bear fruit and know a new boldness,²³² was not accepted by the Pentecostals. Gee argued that one would know one had been filled with the Spirit, not by exhibiting the fruit of the Spirit, which takes time to develop, but by the supernatural manifestation of tongues.²³³ For many early Pentecostals, tongues became the marker of their experience, though ultimately a source of contention between them; since they had come from a wide variety of ecclesiastical backgrounds, this was not surprising.

Boddy began his Pentecostal ministry with a clear belief that the gift of tongues was the sign of having received the Spirit. However, he distinguished between the ability to speak in tongues, that being a sign of the indwelling Spirit and the reception of the gift of tongues, which could be used continuously.²³⁴ This distinction between tongues as a sign and a gift was held almost universally, particularly within Elim.²³⁵ However, Pastor Paul of Germany, challenged this view, on the grounds that some who had spoken in tongues had not subsequently lived holy lives. Consequently, he believed that the gift of tongues could be received at conversion.²³⁶ Paul refused to accept that the gift

²³² Barabas, 145. Cf. Hopkins, E.H. "God's Gift of Holiness" in Stevenson, (1957), 442.

²³³ Gee, D. "To Seekers after the Baptism in the Holy Ghost" Elim Evangel April 1923, 65.

²³⁴ Boddy, A.A. "Tongues as a Seal of Pentecost" Confidence April 1908, 18. This was the first issue of Confidence.

²³⁵ See Barratt, 72; Burton, W.F. "The Baptism in the Holy Ghost" Elim Evangel December 1922, 184f; Jeffreys, G. (1933), 36; Hathaway, W.G. Spiritual Gifts in the Church (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1933), 113; Kingston, C.J.E. Fullness of Power (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1939), 145; Wigglesworth, 101.

²³⁶ Boddy, A.A. "The Conference in Germany" Confidence January 1909, 6. For more details on Jonathan Paul and his role in the German Pentecostal Movement, and the International Conferences, see Van der Laan, C. "The Proceedings of the Leaders' Meetings (1908-1911) and of the International Pentecostal Council (1912-1914)" EPTA

of tongues was an infallible, or even a necessary, sign of being filled with the Spirit.²³⁷ Boddy was influenced by this view and by the close of 1910 argued that tongues did not indicate a baptism of the Spirit, if love was not present in the believer's life.²³⁸ By 1911, Barratt was appealing to the Pentecostals who disagreed with each other regarding this issue of initial evidence, to allow the Spirit 'to bridge over the difficulty'.²³⁹ He suggested that whilst all could be filled with the Spirit, where tongues were evident they were 'a special and gracious evidence of the Holy Spirit's in-dwelling presence'.²⁴⁰ Polman recognised that some had been baptised with the Spirit, and yet had not spoken in tongues, whilst others, due to the evident lack of change in their lives, had spoken in tongues but had not yet received the Spirit. He believed that too much emphasis had been placed on the gift of tongues as a sign, which had led to people trying to encourage the use of tongues through manipulative methods. The sign he wanted to be manifested was love, rather than tongues.²⁴¹

-
- ²³⁷ Bulletin 6:3, 1987, 76-95.
Paul (J. "Was Sollen und wollen die Pfingstgrusse?" Pfingstgrusse 1:1 (Feb. 1909) 31 in Van der Laan, C. (1987), 81) wrote, 'We are not of the opinion that only those speaking in tongues have received the Holy Spirit. Likewise speaking in tongues is for us no evidence in itself that someone has been filled with the Holy Spirit'. This was repeated in the 1912 Declaration of the International Pentecostal Consultative Council that met 4-5 December in Amsterdam. Present were Boddy, Polhill, Polman, Barratt, Humburg, Paul, Voget, Reuss.
- ²³⁸ Boddy, A.A. "Tongues: The Pentecostal Sign; Love, the evidence of continuance" Confidence November 1910, 261.
- ²³⁹ Barratt, T.B. "An Urgent Plea for Charity and Unity" (Part 1) Confidence February 1911, 31.
- ²⁴⁰ Barratt, T.B. "An Urgent Plea for Charity and Unity" (Part 2) Confidence March 1911, 64.
- ²⁴¹ Polman, G. "The Place of Tongues in the Pentecostal Movement" Confidence August 1911, 177. This would be attacked in later Elim publications. Greenway, (H.W. The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit London: Elim Publishing Co., n.d., 8) stated, 'Prayers for 'a "baptism of love" are without scriptural warrant and can be misleading. We are not to wait for love to fall upon us'.

According to Jeffreys' more mature writings, he believed that the evidence for having received the Spirit lay with the teaching of Boddy and Paul. This was in spite of the fact that many of the other early British Pentecostals held to the belief that tongues was the only initial sign of the baptism in the Spirit.²⁴²

Jeffreys stated that there should be some evidence of having received the Spirit, but this could be some other sign than tongues.²⁴³ He believed that this position would stop people being unnecessarily concerned if they had not spoken in tongues, or alternatively, seeking the sign rather than the reality of the experience itself.²⁴⁴ Bradley testifies that this was the policy that Jeffreys had applied to him when he had requested a place at Bible College:

It was many years later that I learned that it was he who opened the door for me to enter E.B.C. [Elim Bible College]²⁴⁵ which I did in May 1927, though he knew I had not spoken in tongues.²⁴⁶

Boulton wrote in 1923 that whilst the Pentecostal experience did have physical manifestations, its chief purpose was 'profoundly spiritual'. The transformed life was the strongest argument for the authenticity of the experience.²⁴⁷

Because Jeffreys made his views well known through his writings, and because the statements of Fundamental beliefs of Elim came to embrace the possibility that there may have been various signs of the baptism in the Spirit, it has been

²⁴² Wigglesworth, 103; Horton (H. The Gifts of the Spirit Luton: Assemblies of God Publishing House, 1949³, 151) wrote, 'Speaking in tongues is the only evidence I see in the scripture of the Baptism in the Holy Ghost'. "A Statement of Fundamental Truths approved by the General Presbytery of the Assemblies of God of Great Britain and Ireland" (Redemption Tidings July 1924, 19) pointed to 'The baptism in the Holy Spirit, the initial evidence of which is the speaking with other tongues.'

²⁴³ Jeffreys, (1933), 36.

²⁴⁴ Ibid., 37.

²⁴⁵ And, therefore, by implication the Elim ministry; at that time entry to the College made one eligible for the ministry.

²⁴⁶ Letter J.T. Bradley to author, 21 October 1993.

²⁴⁷ Boulton, E.C.W. "Pentecost" Elim Evangel October 1923, 202.

assumed that this has always been the view held within Elim.²⁴⁸ However, that is not the case. In the first Constitution, written by Jeffreys and presented to a meeting of the Evangelistic Band in Ireland in December 1922,²⁴⁹ the original wording concerning the baptism in the Spirit was:

We believe that the present latter-day outpouring of the Holy Ghost, which is the promise of God to all believers, is accompanied by speaking in other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance.²⁵⁰

Recognising that this was presented under the name of George Jeffreys, it would be strange if he did not hold to this view when it was published. The change in the statement of fundamental beliefs occurred in the Constitution of 1927.²⁵¹ The wording in this issue stated,

We believe that our Lord Jesus Christ is the Baptiser in the Holy Ghost, and that this Baptism with signs following is promised to every believer.²⁵²

This more open and flexible approach to the baptism in the Spirit was in line with Jeffreys' later ministry, but it is clear that many of the ministers in Elim increasingly struggled to maintain this approach, preferring to stipulate that the gift of tongues should be expected by those seeking the baptism in the Spirit. In 1933, Hathaway refused to become embroiled in the discussion, simply advising people to be open to God's sovereign distribution of the gifts of the Spirit.²⁵³ This refusal to engage in the issue indicates that there was dissension amongst his readers on the issue,²⁵⁴ and also suggests that he may have been

²⁴⁸ For example, see Blumhofer, E.L. "Alexander Boddy ...", 36.

²⁴⁹ Jeffreys, G. The Constitution of the Elim Pentecostal Alliance (London: Battley Bros., 1922). This statement of faith was the one drawn up by Jeffreys for the first Elim church in Hunter Street, Belfast. Cartwright, D. "Echoes from the Past" Elim Evangel 29 January 1983, 6. A statement of Fundamental Truths first appeared in the Elim Evangel in August 1923, 169.

²⁵⁰ Jeffreys, (1922), 6.

²⁵¹ The Constitution of the Foursquare Gospel Churches of Great Britain (Inc. 1927)

²⁵² Ibid. 6. The other change between the two statements concerned healing. It was no longer explained as being provided for in the atonement and 'the privilege of all who believe'; it was now open to all who walked in 'obedience to His will.'

²⁵³ Hathaway, (1933), 80, 102.

²⁵⁴ Published by the publishing arm of the Elim Movement, the book was clearly initially

sympathetic to the alternative arguments. This is confirmed by his subsequent book dealing with the gifts of the Spirit. Published in 1947, after Jeffreys' departure from Elim, he was more definite in his understanding of the gift of tongues. He declared that it was 'normal in the New Testament' for believers to receive the 'power to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance, and this gift ought to be, and generally will be, in evidence.'²⁵⁵ He acknowledged that there were other possible signs, such as prophecy, healing or the working of miracles, but these were deemed to be 'additional visible evidences' to the gift of tongues.²⁵⁶ Kingston accepted that there may be other evidences of Spirit-baptism other than tongues, on the grounds of God's sovereignty, and acknowledged that believers such as Wesley, Whitefield, Hudson Taylor, Muller, Booth and Torrey all had been manifestly filled with the Spirit but had not spoken in tongues. However, he viewed them as atypical in their experience, a possible reason for this absence of tongues being that they had all lived in the days before the pouring out of the Spirit with Pentecostal signs, which had begun in 1900.²⁵⁷ He concluded that tongues were to be seen as the normal sign of the baptism, and should be expected by the vast majority of Christians.²⁵⁸

These writers reveal the transition from the belief that the gift of tongues is a sign to one that held that the gift of tongues was **the** sign of the baptism of the

directed to the Elim church members.

²⁵⁵ Hathaway, (1947), 61.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., 62. Contra Bush, 30, who gave the impression that Hathaway was still holding to tongues being one possible sign amongst a number. The use of the word 'additional' would contradict this point of view.

²⁵⁷ Kingston, 142.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 145.

Spirit. Jeffreys was in a minority amongst the early leaders of Elim, certainly amongst early British Pentecostals, in holding to a more open policy of recognising the baptism in the Spirit. Increasingly writers were convinced that the ability to speak in tongues was the infallible sign of being filled with the Spirit.²⁵⁹ By 1976, Walker clearly asserted, 'We avow that speaking in tongues ... is the Bible evidence of receiving the baptism in the Holy Spirit'.²⁶⁰ Jones pointed to the 'vital evidential purpose' that speaking in tongues provided.²⁶¹

6. Conclusion

The theology of Keswick had been a practical theology, that is, one that was intended to be lived out rather than merely debated, offering weakened Christians the promise of a new level of spirituality. The Pentecostal message was similar, but included the addition of the gift of tongues, whereby the individual could be certain that they had been accepted by God, and thus was now able to live this life successfully. In time, the teaching of Keswick and the

²⁵⁹ 'The physical blessing has a physical sign, namely, speaking with languages as God gives the utterance.' Cauty, G. In my Father's House: Pentecostal expositions of major Christian truths (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1969), 99.

²⁶⁰ Walker, T.W. "The baptism in the Holy Spirit" in Brewster, P.S. (ed.) Pentecostal Doctrine (Cheltenham: Grenehurst Press, 1976), 34.

²⁶¹ Jones, W.R. "The Nine Gifts of the Holy Spirit" in Brewster, (1976), 59. In the light of the changes in practice and expectation as reflected in Elim publications, it is significant that the Fundamentals have not been changed to reflect this. In 1993, a committee reported back to the Ministerial Conference on its findings concerning a revision of the statement of fundamental beliefs. Regarding the possibility of any changes concerning the baptism in the Spirit, the report said, 'The committee was divided on the definition of "signs" which followed the Baptism in the Holy Spirit. As it is believed that this division is indicative of the position throughout the Movement it was decided that the wording of the existing Fundamental on this point should be retained.' Report of the Committee set up to consider a revision of the statement of Fundamental Truths. This was presented to the 1993 Conference, and then to the 1994 Conference for ratification. The members of the committee were W. Crawford, E.R. Corsie, T.G. Hills, M. Jones, J. Lancaster, I.W. Lewis, J.C. Smyth, K. Warrington, J.W. Ward. In 1977, Julian Ward's questionnaire to ministers revealed that 21 ministers believed that the gift of tongues always accompanied Spirit-baptism, whilst 19 believed that it did not.

Pentecostals became totally estranged from each other, differing fundamentally in their views of the work of the Spirit. An anonymous editorial in the short-lived Elim publication The Foursquare Revivalist highlighted the superior attitude Elim began to take towards Keswick:

God blesses every foregathering of His children as far as they permit Him to do so and as far as His servants who minister the Word so permit Him, in the scope and attitude toward Christ of their ministries. We pray for and ardently desire a greater need of blessing to the Keswick movement: a deeper insight into the purposes and enlarging gifts of the Spirit in these days of need. They are not days in which movements with the character and history of the Keswick platform can afford to discountenance any part of the Word of God written, or to halt from accompanying with Christ upon His further quest of blessing and spiritual gifts for His people.²⁶²

However, the influence, and the attendant theological concepts, of Keswick on the early Pentecostals in general, and George Jeffreys and Elim in particular, are clear to see.

The significance of this section on the understanding of the work of the Spirit lies in Jeffreys' willingness to hold to minority viewpoints. Although he adhered to the general Pentecostal understanding of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit and its relationship to sanctification, on other issues relating to the Spirit he held to distinctly minority positions. He regarded the Spirit of Christ and the Holy Spirit as distinct, and believed that tongues was not the only sign of being filled with the Spirit. On both these issues Jeffreys came to a conclusion which, whilst generally disregarded by others, allowed him to explain the reality of situations that he had encountered. His theology was essentially pragmatic. In the future discussions concerning church government in particular, his pragmatism will be

²⁶² "Keswick's Continuing Message", Foursquare Revivalist, 10 August 1928, 1. Emphasis is in the original.

further demonstrated. For Jeffreys, scripture and theology was a tool to be used to prop up existing matters of conscience, rather than an arbiter of practice.

Although there is no direct evidence of major disagreements concerning doctrine, it is significant that in the formation of the two major emphases of Jeffreys' life and ministry, revival and the work of the Spirit, he held to views that were accepted only by a minority of Pentecostals. The significance of this evidence can be viewed in a number of ways. Positively, it is evidence that Jeffreys was an independent thinker, unafraid to hold to positions that he felt were Biblically viable, regardless of the opinions of others. More negatively, it could be argued that Jeffreys was always likely to hold to unorthodox positions, viewing the fact that others did not hold to such beliefs as a vindication of his self-perception that he was the enlightened one. As the thesis develops, it will be suggested that the weight of evidence favours this latter understanding. Finally it is significant that Jeffreys was willing to sanitise accounts of his own Christian experiences if he felt that by publicising them they would be damaging to his ministry. As was seen in the section concerning revival, Jeffreys' greatest concern was the position that he was able to maintain in the public's eye. His position was to be guarded at all costs. It was this standing within Elim, vindicated by his evangelistic success, that underpinned his belief that his ideas concerning church government were to be accepted. It this success which will now be investigated.

3 An analysis of Jeffreys' evangelistic success

Walker is correct in identifying Jeffreys as Britain's most successful evangelist and healer of the twentieth century.²⁶³ His evangelistic campaigns in England were particularly effective during the years 1924-34. The crowds who attended did not merely listen to Jeffreys, but responded to his message and the call to conversion. In 1928, the Daily News, Daily Express, Daily Telegraph and Daily Herald all contained reports of the 1000 people baptised at the service held at the Royal Albert Hall on Easter Monday.²⁶⁴ In 1929, 600 people professed conversion in the evangelistic campaign held in Brixton; of these, nearly 300 were baptised at the Elim Bible College, with 3,000 in attendance.²⁶⁵ The highlight of the following year was Jeffreys preaching in the Bingley Hall, Birmingham. This evangelistic campaign had begun in the 1200-seater Ebenezer Chapel, but out of necessity had moved to the 3,000-seater Town Hall. The services then moved to the Skating Rink, seating 8,000, until on Whit Monday the 15,000 capacity Bingley Hall was booked and filled.²⁶⁶ This was arguably the pinnacle of his British preaching career in terms of popularity. The number of reported converts from the 90 meetings held in Birmingham was in excess of 10,000.²⁶⁷ Brooks reported that in 1934-1935, 1400 people

²⁶³ Walker, (1998³), 260.

²⁶⁴ Phillips, E.J. Unpublished, hand-written notes for the Coming of Age Celebration in the Royal Albert Hall, 1936. He reported that 10,000 had been in attendance in these services.

²⁶⁵ Ibid., cf. Cartwright, 96f, who indicates it was nearer to 200 baptisms.

²⁶⁶ Coates, C.A. "The Nineteenth Centenary of Pentecost" Elim Evangel, 23 May 1930, 321f.

²⁶⁷ Cartwright, 105. An interesting sidelight on these figures is given by a short report of a series of meetings that the churches in Birmingham were holding at the same time as Jeffreys' meetings. 3,000 had attended services in the Birmingham Town Hall, with another 2,000 unable to gain entrance. "Concise Comments and Interesting Items" Elim Evangel 27 June 1930, 408.

There is an interesting comparison with another Elim minister, John Dyke, who was evangelising at that time. After a campaign in Merthyr, he sent the following statistics to Hathaway: 78 Commitment Cards had been received. Of these, 24 people were

responded in York, 1500 in Brighton, 1500 in Dundee, 1200 in Nottingham, 2000 in Leeds, 3000 in Cardiff and 12,000 in a series of meetings held in Switzerland.²⁶⁸ This resulted in the number of Elim churches increasing from 15 in 1920 to 233 in 1937.²⁶⁹

Since the purpose of this thesis is to account for the dislocation of the Elim Movement in 1940 after a period of significant growth and evangelistic success, it is necessary to understand the part that Jeffreys' evangelistic ministry played in the dislocation of Jeffreys' relationship with the Movement. That he had a remarkable evangelistic ministry cannot be denied. However, that success led him to believe that any changes he desired to introduce into the government of the Movement would be accepted on the basis of his own evangelistic ministry. This section will examine the perception that Jeffreys had of himself and the perception he had of his standing within the denomination. It will be suggested that because of the results of his ministry, he had an overweening assessment of his own significance. The popular understanding for Jeffreys' ministry will be presented, followed by additional reasons for the phenomenal success of Elim during this period.

saved or attending regularly; 20 were definitely not saved; 11 had returned to other churches; 3 had moved away; 6 old people had found the distance too great; 1 had joined the Dowlais church; 9 were attending another church, they were 'runabouts'; 4 were not traced. Dyke summed up the experience, 'I think that this experience has been the most humiliating of my Christian life.' (Letter to W.G. Hathaway, 2 February 1937). Hathaway agreed, 'it is most unsatisfactory'. (Letter to J. Dyke, 5 February 1937). These figures would be expected, and even welcomed, in contemporary church missions. The expectations of the Pentecostals at that time were very high.

²⁶⁸ Brooks, 28-32. cf Edsor, (1964), 29-43. Wilson's (Wilson, 111) comment that people may have made multiple conversion decisions is valid. The 'decisions' made may well have been for many different reasons, other than as a first-time commitment to Christianity. However, that so many people attended the services and made public responses needs to be noted.

²⁶⁹ Cartwright, D. Unpublished notes. (n.d.)

1. Jeffreys' perception of his own ministry.

There is clear evidence that George was nurtured from early childhood with a sense of high personal self-esteem, aware of a particular purpose to fulfil.

From an early age, he pretended to lead church services,²⁷⁰ indicating in Healing Rays that this demonstrated his awareness of having been 'called to preach the gospel' from the 'earliest days of childhood'.²⁷¹ His early experience of church life was under the ministry of Rev. Glasnant Jones of Siloh Chapel, Nantyffyllon.²⁷² Jeffreys was encouraged to take a full part in the ministry of the church from a young age. Jones recalled:

At the open-air revival services I always found young Jeffreys at my side. I was privileged to give him his early religious tuition and a splendid scholar he was. Superior to other lads, there was character in his face: I knew he was a "chosen vessel".²⁷³

This was written after Jeffreys had proved to be a successful minister.

However, if this perception was shared with Jeffreys at that time, it would have encouraged him to believe himself to be particularly blessed and set apart by God.

In September 1912, Jeffreys applied for a place at the Pentecostal Missionary Union Bible School, under the direction of Thomas Myerscough, with a view to entering the ministry.²⁷⁴ Significantly, the finances for his studies were paid for

²⁷⁰ Cartwright, 24.

²⁷¹ Jeffreys, (1932), 56-57, cf. Boulton, 12.

²⁷² Cartwright, 19.

²⁷³ Boulton, 11.

²⁷⁴ Cartwright, (1986, 30-31) states that the School's address was 134 St Thomas' Road, Preston. He was accepted by the Council in September and began his studies in November 1912. He was only at the school until January 1913, when Stephen asked for his help with the campaign at Cwmtwrch. One of the results of this successful series of meetings was that the brothers were invited to speak at the Sunderland Convention. Elsewhere, Cartwright (D. "Echoes from the past" Elim Evangel 22 January 1983, 6) writes that Jeffreys seems to have returned to the School, at their request, for a period, being photographed with other students in October 1913. However, a few months later it was minuted that he had been absent from the school

by Cecil Polhill (1860-1938), the President of the Pentecostal Missionary Union, after Jeffreys had met him whilst ministering at the Tro'r Glien Mission.²⁷⁵ Polhill had attained national fame as one of the 'Cambridge Seven'.²⁷⁶ He had returned to Britain from Tibet convinced that a new generation of missionaries were needed. After being baptised in the Spirit, he provided the financial backing for many of the activities of the new Pentecostal movement, including the rescuing of Confidence from financial disaster on a number of occasions.²⁷⁷ This willingness to use his wealth gave the movement a secure basis from which to work. From 1909, Polhill worked as a partner with Boddy, hosting conferences to broadcast the Pentecostal message and encourage Pentecostal groups. To Jeffreys, an unknown young man from South Wales, Polhill's support was viewed as part of the divine seal of approval on his call to the ministry which had been with him since childhood.²⁷⁸ He believed that his decision to 'take a stand ... for truth' in attending Myerscough's Bible School had subsequently been vindicated by the 'marvels [miracles] that make one wonder'.²⁷⁹

again due to his missions, and 'the Council thought it very desirable for him to return to Preston for training under Mr Myerscough at an early date and it was resolved that Mr Polhill see G. Jeffreys thereon'. However, Polhill was unsuccessful in persuading him to return.

²⁷⁵ Llewellyn, 37.

²⁷⁶ Pollock, J. The Cambridge Seven (London: IVP, 1959), 100-105.

²⁷⁷ Taylor, M. Publish and be Blessed (PhD diss. University of Birmingham, 1994), 53. Taylor outlines the number of times Polhill gave to Boddy's 'Confidence' so that it would be able to continue publication. (150, 160, 164, 175) In addition, between 1920-24 he donated £8,450.00 to the work of Pentecostal foreign missions in China and Tibet. (160) He also paid off the balance of the Azusa Street Mission in 1908. (350) There is no extensive biography of Polhill and his influence in the nascent Pentecostal movement has been much under-valued.

²⁷⁸ Jeffreys (G "Christmas and New Year Greetings" Elim Evangel 25 December 1929, 529-530) wrote, 'From the moment I uncompromisingly entered the open door of the Christian ministry right up to the present day, God has been faithful and His abundant grace has been lavished upon myself and the work entrusted to my charge.'

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 530.

After supporting his brother, Stephen, in evangelistic campaigns in Swansea, he attracted the attention of Alexander Boddy. Since 1908 and the publication of Confidence, Boddy had been at the centre of British Pentecostalism. In 1913, Boddy went to Wales to visit the two brothers.²⁸⁰ It was during this visit that he invited George to speak at the Sunderland Convention. It was Jeffreys' task to preach the gospel each evening, after the other main speakers had delivered their addresses. He was 24 years old, a very young man in comparison to the other major speakers that year: Boddy was 59, Myerscough was 51, Polhill was 53, Mogridge was 59, and Leech was 56. Jeffreys had been catapulted into the midst of leaders who were older and vastly more experienced in ministry. This opportunity to take a major part in the meetings, which was a focal point for Pentecostalism,²⁸¹ sealed Jeffreys' future. Firstly, it gave him a platform to attract the attention of Pentecostals who had gathered from all over Europe. Secondly, it placed him amongst the older leaders of the new Pentecostal Movement; it was obvious that his role would become more

²⁸⁰ The account of their first meeting was reported in Confidence March 1913 (Boddy, A.A. "The Welsh Revivalists Revisited", 47-49). This meeting was the result of the reports that Boddy heard of the successful evangelistic meetings in Wales, these were reported in Confidence February 1913, (Boddy, A.A. "An Apostolic Welsh Revival", 27-29). He quoted a letter that George had sent previously detailing the progress of the meetings. The exact nature of the relationship between Boddy and Jeffreys is worthy of further exploration. In May 1915, a letter Jeffreys wrote to Boddy was published in Confidence (89) which closed by sending his 'Christian love and greetings to dear Mrs Boddy and all at the Vicarage'. He signed it 'Your younger brother'. Confidence reported the activities of the Elim Evangelistic Band regularly, see Confidence December 1914, 233; May 1915, 89; May 1916, 81-82; August 1916, 130-131; March-April 1917, 19-20; April-June 1918, 19-21; July-September 1918, 53-55; October- December 1919, 59.

²⁸¹ Elim Evangel 25 September 1976, 8-9 carried a picture of the male delegates at the 1913 Sunderland Convention. There are 78 pictured. With the addition of women and any possible men who were not included in the picture, the number present could be estimated at around 150-175. Gee ((1967), 37) comments that although the numbers were never large, attracting 'a few hundreds at the most', the significance of the Conventions was 'in their formative influence in attracting and helping to mould not only the immediate leaders of the multitudinous little Pentecostal meetings..., but (also) the younger men who were destined to become leaders of the Movement'.

significant as the older generation continued to age. For Jeffreys, the fact that he, a young man from a poor family in South Wales, had been given the platform to speak to leaders from Europe was seen to be God's commendation of his life and ministry. Thirdly, it was here that William Gillespie heard him preach and invited him to Ireland. As a result the Elim Evangelistic Band was launched, with the aim of evangelistic meetings being conducted and churches planted. The years of 1914-34 were the years of Jeffreys' remarkable success, where, almost without exception, every town and city he visited saw him conducting huge meetings. This, combined with his mothers' protective attitude towards her son, the encouragement he had received from his minister, the fact that he was beginning to be noticed by some of the most prominent men in English Christendom, and the invitations he received to participate in Pentecostal conventions as the youngest speaker, allows one to understand the confidence and self-belief that he demonstrated in his later ministry.

2. The perception that Jeffreys had of his standing with the laity within Elim

Jeffreys encouraged the laity within Elim to see themselves as integral supports to his own ministry. Each Christmas edition of the Elim Evangel contained an article written by Jeffreys reviewing the previous year's activities during which he constantly emphasised his need of the people. A common image employed was that of being engaged in a war:²⁸² Jeffreys and his Party were on the

²⁸² For example, see Jeffreys, G. "Christmas and New Year Greetings" Elim Evangel 25 December 1929, 529 and "Christmas and New Year Greetings" 25 December 1930, 801.

front-line of the battle, sustained by the prayers of the Elim 'family'.²⁸³ He wrote,

The spiritual soil gathered in from the Foursquare battle front is but the result of your faith and the answer to your prayers. Having participated with me in the strain and stress of warfare, you shall surely share with me the joys of reward at the Bema of Christ.²⁸⁴

He continued by expressing his confidence for the future since he knew that he 'had your prayers behind me, your love for me, your confidence in me, and your unfailing loyalty'.²⁸⁵ In his Christmas letter of 1936, he expressed 'the depths of gratitude in my heart towards my world-wide family for their prevailing prayers, undying devotion, and personal love'.²⁸⁶ This language does not necessarily reveal the devotion that people had for Jeffreys, but the devotion he believed he could command. It is the language of the leader who believed that he had people behind his cause who would go to any lengths to serve and sustain him. The emphasis upon people's loyalty and devotion is significant. It highlighted the fact that he believed himself to be the fulcrum of the development of the churches, and encouraged the belief that if anything should happen to him, the churches would be bereft. Jeffreys seemingly encouraged an unhealthy leader-follower relationship.

²⁸³ The Elim 'family' was another common image. Jeffreys would constantly use the phrase in the Christmas editions. (25 December 1929, 529-530; 25 December 1930, 801-801; 25 December 1932, 817; 25 December 1933, 801-802; 25 December 1934, 801-802.) Pastor Kennedy spoke to me at length about how ministers and people believed that Elim was 'our Movement and we were proud of anything that we did'. This was sealed with the 'family spirit' that pervaded Elim at that time. J.C. Kennedy, Interview, op. cit.

²⁸⁴ Jeffreys, G. "Christmas and New Year Greetings" Elim Evangel 25 December 1929, 529.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., 530.

²⁸⁶ Jeffreys, G., "Christmas 1915 - Christmas 1936" Elim Evangel 25 December 1936, 802.

This interpretation is borne out by the fact that in all the arguments relating to the subsequent split, Jeffreys reassured himself of the devotion of congregations and ministers. In 1933, Jeffreys informed Phillips that in the midst of problems being experienced in Irish churches, he had received the support of

the quiet, unassuming yet loyal members of our churches who have no way of expressing themselves. This class of person tells me on every hand, "Pastor, it is our love for you that keeps us going to Elim under present conditions".²⁸⁷

The language used by Jeffreys stressed the devotion of his supporters, whilst also indicating that people in desperate situations expected him to be their saviour-figure. The Elim Evangel's use of his picture could leave people in no doubt regarding Jeffreys' own understanding of his fundamental place in the Movement. His portrait appeared in almost every copy of the magazine; particularly in the weeks preceding the massed meetings at the Albert Hall and Crystal Palace the pictures were of Jeffreys superimposed above the crowds and buildings.²⁸⁸ The picture of him standing above, and 'leaning' on the Royal Albert Hall, proclaimed the eloquent message that the prestigious building was to be dwarfed by the spiritual giant. Keegan, writing of leadership in general, highlights this 'theatrical impulse' which is 'both expected and reinforced by audiences to which they [the leaders] perform'.²⁸⁹ He writes,

The leader of men ... can show himself to his followers only through a mask, a mask that he must make for himself, but a mask made in such form as will mark him to men of his time and place as the leader they want and need.²⁹⁰

This was certainly true of Jeffreys' relationship with his followers in Elim.

²⁸⁷ Letter Jeffreys to Phillips, 23 October 1933.

²⁸⁸ See front cover of Elim Evangel 15 April 1932 for a particular example of this.

²⁸⁹ Keegan, J. The Mask of Command, (London: Penguin, 1987), 11.

²⁹⁰ Ibid.

This adulation was encouraged and sustained by members of Jeffreys' Revival Party. Edsor explained the appeal of Jeffreys,

When you are with the Principal you always feel the presence of God. You feel it in the Principal's modesty, his simplicity, his humility. ... People *worship him* because they feel the divine presence in him; and yet he is as simple as though he were no-one in particular.²⁹¹

This obsequious explanation emphasised the perception that Edsor, rather than the general public, had of Jeffreys. The two surprising comments are that people 'worship him' and that 'he is as simple as though he were no-one in particular'. The word 'worship' may simply have been used as a synonym for adore. However, it is significant that he used the word at all. If Edsor believed Jeffreys to be the recipient of such worship and one who did not object to that level of devotion, it suggests an unhealthy relationship between Jeffreys and his coterie of supporters. This description of Jeffreys, given to a non-Christian journalist, reveals the unquestioning loyalty given to Jeffreys by members of his Revival Party. The final clause indicates, despite protestations to the contrary, that Edsor clearly did not believe Jeffreys to be on a par with the general public. One can only assume that Jeffreys, receiving this devotion, would have become accustomed to this level of support and assumed that this emotion engendered was common to all ministers and members within Elim. It is no surprise that he was, therefore, unprepared to accept criticism from any party. This, added to the understanding that Jeffreys had of his ministry and his belief that people were dependent upon him, resulted in Jeffreys being caught in the trap of an unrealistic judgement of his own ability and judgement.

²⁹¹

Landau, 132. Italics mine.

In the events surrounding the struggle for the denomination, both Jeffreys and Phillips were very aware of his popularity with the people; to a large extent the struggle became a game of wits as Jeffreys attempted to use this to his own advantage, and Phillips tried to block the efforts. In a letter written to Phillips in 1935, Jeffreys assured him, 'I will still be their [the pastors'] leader whichever way the voting goes'.²⁹² However, fifteen months later Phillips challenged Jeffreys, 'you must appreciate that the fact that we are more than you in touch with our Ministers and Churches'.²⁹³ At the 1940 Conference, Phillips acknowledged that Jeffreys could 'swing scores of churches over to British Israelism' by the force of his personality. He argued that this was the reason that Jeffreys was so keen to include lay representation in the voting system. Phillips believed that his task was to protect the churches from the force of Jeffreys' personality.²⁹⁴ The fact that both leaders overlooked was that people were engaged in national and personal matters of far greater importance that made the arguments concerning their relative popularity appear fatuous. Jeffreys believed in his own central significance in the lives of the ministers and laity in Elim; Phillips, to the extent he reacted out of fear of Jeffreys' persuasiveness, betrayed the fact that he believed Jeffreys' own assessment to be true.

3. Popular explanations for Jeffreys' success

For the members of Elim and Jeffreys' fellow-workers, the reasons for his phenomenal ministry were obvious. Jeffreys was deemed to be 'anointed with

²⁹² Letter Jeffreys to Phillips, 18 November 1935.

²⁹³ Letter Phillips to Jeffreys, 23 February 1937.

²⁹⁴ Appendix 2.

the Holy Spirit'.²⁹⁵ In 1936, an illuminated address was given to Jeffreys on behalf of all the Elim church members in gratitude for his ministry over the previous 25 years. The address outlined appreciation for the ministry he had undertaken.

To Principal George Jeffreys

We, beloved Principal, the undersigned, on behalf of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance Churches in the British Isles, wish to place on record our deep appreciation and heartfelt gratitude to God for the great service you have, through His grace, rendered to the people of these lands. Twenty-one years ago you were led to the shores of Ireland, and gave that island the honour of being the cradle of what is today one of the greatest religious awakenings of modern times. We have viewed with thankfulness the establishment of the Elim Bible College, and the great company of preachers you have ordained to the ministry of Christ. We have watched with joy the extension and progress of the work in our own and other lands, and have seen the answer to our prayers in the multitude of lives and homes which have been transformed under your ministry.

As an Apostle, you have pioneered the Full Gospel message and established churches in the largest cities and towns of the British Isles. As an Evangelist, your ministry has been signally owned and blessed of God.

Through your faithful proclamation of the old-fashioned gospel you have led countless thousands to Christ.

As a preacher and teacher, you have stood uncompromisingly for the Word of God, your expositions of the Sacred Scriptures have enriched our minds and hearts.

As a leader, you have stood like a bulwark in the midst of back-sliding and departure from the faith.

Kindly receive this Address at the Coming of Age Celebrations in the Royal Albert Hall, London, as a token of our sincere regard for your past and as an assurance of our prayerful interest and loyal support for the future, as you continue to follow our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.²⁹⁶

His success was deemed to be the result of his having served God with the ministry gifts he had received, namely those of apostle and evangelist. That his ministry as evangelist should be so credited is unsurprising. The unexpected reference is to Jeffreys being an apostle. Because of the extent to which the Apostolic Faith Church, and subsequently the Apostolic Church had

²⁹⁵ Brooks, 28.

²⁹⁶ Signed 1 June 1936. Quoted in Edsor, (1964) 69-72.

been viewed with suspicion,²⁹⁷ the term 'apostle' had been hitherto avoided. Clearly Jeffreys' ministry had overcome these earlier concerns. Of equal interest is that the titles 'Principal', 'Apostle', and 'Evangelist' were all used with capital letters. As there was only one Principal in the Elim Movement, so there was only one Apostle and one Evangelist. This contrast with the titles preacher, teacher and leader, all of which use the lower-case. Jeffreys was viewed as the undisputed evangelist and apostle, but was only one among many preachers, teachers and, significantly, leaders. The Executive Council were determined to limit his leadership to the areas in which they deemed him to be gifted. This became a source of major conflict by 1939.

The dominant reason given for the effectiveness of Jeffreys' evangelistic work was due to him preaching 'uncompromisingly' the 'old-fashioned gospel'.²⁹⁸ This gospel was fundamentally concerned with the immanence of Jesus. Jeffreys' message was constantly Jesu-centric: not only could one receive Jesus as saviour, healer, baptiser and coming king, it was the believer's right and privilege to work as partners, co-workers, with Jesus.²⁹⁹ Although twenty

²⁹⁷ Gee (1967), 104-106.

²⁹⁸ This 'old fashioned gospel' contrasted with the perceived inadequacies of Modernism, and in particular attacks on the veracity of the Scriptural record. For the defence of the fundamentalist gospel, see Elim Evangel 4 March 1932, 153-156; 11 March 1932, 161-166; 9 September 1932, 577-579; 4 November 1932, 707-709; 17 February 1933, 105-106; 24 February 1933, 116-118; 19 January 1934, 33-34; 5 October 1934, 627; 17 May 1935, 307-309, 320; 12 July 1935, 443-444; 7 February 1936, 81-82, 83-85, 88-89, 92; 14 February 1936, 104-105, 110; 11 June 1937, 376-381; 26 November 1937, 764-765; 3 December 1937, 776-77, 784; 25 February 1938, 123; 3 June 1938, 344-346; 10 June 1938, 353-355; 24 June 1938, 385-387; 8 July 1938, 424-425, 432. From the early 1930s the frontispiece of the Elim Evangel announced that Elim 'contends for the FAITH against all modern thought, Higher Criticism and New Theology'. Many of the articles identified Pentecostalism with Fundamentalism, with only one or two questioning whether this was possible since the Fundamentalists took an anti-supernatural stance in their expectation of contemporary miracles.

²⁹⁹ Jeffreys, (1929), 7.

**PAGE
MISSING
IN
ORIGINAL**

mouth, dark curly hair and a fine presence'. He described his voice as 'a strong baritone, although in no way aggressive'.³⁰⁵ Gee believed that, 'God had given him the natural gifts of a magnetic personality and a voice like music.'³⁰⁶

It was particularly to this voice that Landau attributed Jeffreys' popularity,

I did not doubt that the strong and sincere tone of the voice of Jeffreys was responsible for much of the veneration in which his followers held him.³⁰⁷

4. Jeffreys' self-preservation as a reason for his evangelistic success

However, linked to this impressive ability to communicate effectively to crowds of people was Jeffreys' insistence that secrecy should be maintained on certain issues, in particular from the general public, but at times even from his closest colleagues. It could be argued that, although this was infuriating for his colleagues, it did have the desired effect of allowing Jeffreys to appear to be above any suspicion. In the arguments that followed it is significant that Jeffreys experienced the haemorrhaging of ministerial support when Phillips spoke directly to Conference about Jeffreys' character, rather than simply his proposed reforming schemes. For Phillips, Jeffreys was a deeply flawed character, and it was for this reason that he could not be trusted with the leadership of the Movement.

Although Jeffreys' public persona had huge appeal, in private he was shy and reserved to a marked degree.³⁰⁸ Jeffreys had surrounded himself with the

³⁰⁵ Landau, 122.

³⁰⁶ Gee, D. "George Jeffreys", Pentecost March-May 1962, 11.

³⁰⁷ Landau, 113.

³⁰⁸ Before Rom Landau, the only journalist to interview Jeffreys, saw him, one of Jeffreys' aides told him, 'I am afraid it was very hard to persuade the Principal to see you, he never sees anyone unconnected with his work. He does not even receive gentlemen who write from the press. I don't think he will be able to give you more than five

Revival Party, and even ministers in Elim knew little of his personal life.

Therefore, it was not surprising that the only interview given to a non-Christian stumbled because of Jeffreys' incapability, or unwillingness, to talk about his personal life. On meeting him, Landau commented that he was 'painfully shy. He was feeling nervous and obviously hated himself for having promised to receive me'.³⁰⁹ The interview yielded little information, apart from Jeffreys' description of the healing he had received as a boy. Landau had to interview a member of the Revival Party to gain more information about Jeffreys.³¹⁰

This propensity for privacy, however, was not confined merely to his contact with journalists; on occasions it was revealed in his correspondence with Phillips. In 1935, when Pastor Corry was required to include Jeffreys' age on travel documentation, Jeffreys warned Phillips about the need for absolute discretion. He wrote,

By the way, give a gentle hint to Corry that he must treat the age question in absolute confidence. We have proved in this work, that it is better to let people guess all kinds of ages. For some reason or other it works better. In any case it is our wish and I know he will regard such.³¹¹

This seems to be a trivial matter and yet indicates the distance that Jeffreys maintained from the general public. There was a mystique about the revivalist that was sustained by the withholding of such information.

minutes.' Landau, 130.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., 130.

³¹⁰ Landau did not indicate who this was, but referred to meeting the Revival Party's pianist. Edsor later confirmed that he had been the main source for Landau's chapter. Edsor, (1989), 13.

³¹¹ Letter Jeffreys to Phillips, 11 February 1935. At this time he was 45 years old.

Details surrounding his ordination were also shrouded in secrecy. Jeffreys had been ordained twice, by two separate bodies, and feared that if this became widely known, it would be 'serious and might mean trouble'.³¹² His first ordination service had been in an independent Apostolic body, the Emmanuel Christ Church, Maesteg on 13 January 1912. However, he was subsequently ordained on 18 July 1917 by Rev. Moelfryn Morgan, a Welsh Congregational minister, and Stephen Jeffreys, the service being conducted at the Elim Church, Hunter Street, Belfast.³¹³ His Elim certificate of ordination clearly referred to the prior ordination and indicated that since ordination he had 'been ministering as an Evangelist in Baptist, Congregational, Wesleyan, Methodist, Society of Friends and Apostolic Churches'.³¹⁴ However, Jeffreys was clearly alarmed lest the public knew that this had been his second ordination. He instructed Phillips,

Do not refer to the first ordination service to anyone. I have purposely kept it out of my book ... Be sure and deal with the ordination question so as to keep me clear before the public.³¹⁵

The alarm surrounded the perceived link between himself and William Hutchinson. At the time of Jeffreys' first ordination Hutchinson was doctrinally orthodox; however, as time passed, Hutchinson was viewed with increasing suspicion. Jeffreys feared that he could be maligned by opponents of Pentecostalism because of his previous association with him. Therefore, Jeffreys felt that it was very important to keep this first ordination secret from the public.

³¹² Letter Jeffreys to Phillips, 28 September 1928.

³¹³ Boulton, 40. There is no record of who ordained Stephen.

³¹⁴ George Jeffreys' Ordination Certificate. A picture appeared in Cartwright, D. "Echoes of the Past" Elim Evangel 29 January 1983, 7. The second mission at Penybont was at a Quaker meeting house, Cartwright 31-32.

³¹⁵ Letter Jeffreys to Phillips, 28 September 1928.

At times, he operated with no sense of accountability to his other leaders, making decisions with no prior consultation. His brother, William, was an Elim minister for a period. In July 1924, Henderson informed Phillips that William wanted to move to Dowlais to pastor the independent church there and had asked that his name be removed from the list of Elim workers. Henderson told Phillips that he had asked George about the situation and the circumstances surrounding his departure, but was given no information. He told Phillips, 'he [George] has settled it up. What he did or arranged I don't know.' His final comment on the matter expressed his dissatisfaction with George's handling of the situation, 'It is an absolutely rotten way of working. The Pastor should have given you or me the proper facts of what was being arranged'.³¹⁶ It is clear that in this case, George's particular relationship to William precipitated his actions and the fact that he should have informed other leaders had not been deemed significant.

Jeffreys was accused of secrecy in financial matters by Phillips in 1941.³¹⁷ He accused Jeffreys of never publishing the accounts of the Bible Pattern Fellowship, even though its ministers had requested this; neither had the World Revival Crusade produced any accounts, nor revealed salaries that its members received. In the immediate aftermath of the split, the Executive Council issued a pamphlet accusing Jeffreys of having followed a policy of secrecy. He had 'insisted that all matters of the Alliance should be kept

³¹⁶ Letter W. Henderson to Phillips 19 July 1924.

³¹⁷ Appendix 3.

private'. This, they claimed, contrasted sharply with the Council who, as soon as they were formed, 'removed this rule from their books'.³¹⁸

Jeffreys wanted to maintain his popularity with the public and was prepared to use various methods to ensure this. If necessary, this would include the deliberate blurring of facts, as he did with details concerning the baptism in the Holy Spirit. At times, personal interest compelled him to make decisions with no prior consultation with others and no subsequent explanation. This manipulation of details was a trait that Phillips and the leaders in Elim feared was being used by Jeffreys during the time of the split. The fact that he had been willing to guard the truth from the public in the past suggests that Phillips was wise to be suspicious of Jeffreys' motives in 1939-1940.

In attempting to account for Jeffreys' success, it would not be the intention of this thesis to deny the reality of the spiritual factors involved, nor denigrate the personal talents that Jeffreys clearly had. However, there are other factors that need to be taken into account in assessing his evangelistic appeal. Since Jeffreys and his supporters believed that his work as revivalist vindicated his desires for church reform, the conditions in which Jeffreys was ministering prior to World War II need to be examined. If there were particular reasons for the extent of his success, then it is possible to suggest that Phillips, and the Elim leadership, were correct to assume that his ministry did not qualify him to operate in a manner that suggested infallibility on all issues. This appeal to his

³¹⁸ Pamphlet "Elim and Principal George Jeffreys" (London: Elim Publishing Co., January 1941), 4.

ministry was made in 1940 by his supporters. They argued that if God had blessed Jeffreys, then to argue that he had been wrong was illogical. For example, Parker argued that Jeffreys should be allowed absolute control of the leadership in determining the development of the Movement since the greatest growth in terms of 'its solid work, its rapid growth, its unity and its freedom from division' happened 'during Principal Jeffreys' greater control of the work'.³¹⁹

5. Social reasons for Jeffreys' evangelistic success

Jeffreys' success will be examined against the conditions of social dislocation that were evident at the time of his evangelistic ministry. It will be suggested that Jeffreys invited people to create a world that was separate from their own existing experience, and yet not totally divorced from it. Branson, commenting on the changes introduced into society during this period, expressed the uncertainty that was evident, writing,

The stability of the Edwardian era had gone and with it the assured viewpoint, the confident certainties about right and wrong ... Many people, particularly among the older generation, were, of course, resisting the new ideas and trying desperately to preserve intact their own beliefs. Meanwhile, the erosion of settled values was accompanied by a deepening sense of insecurity widespread among the middle classes.³²⁰

The attitude of the Elim ministers to these changes was ambivalent.³²¹ On certain issues, they viewed the innovations with great suspicion, for example,

³¹⁹ Parker, P.G. Pamphlet, "Another reply" (London: Crystal Publications Ltd., n.d.) 5.

³²⁰ Branson, N. Britain in the Nineteen Twenties. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1995), 97-99.

³²¹ One example will suffice to show this ambivalence. Although many of George Jeffreys' sermons and Albert Edsor's playing of hymns had been recorded on to gramophone records, and widely distributed, they were only designed to be used by people in their own homes. In 1933, a Ministerial Conference proposal was passed unanimously against Elim gramophone records being played at a crusader meeting, or in a church building. It was not deemed to be acceptable, even if the intention had been to teach a hymn. Conference Minutes, Wednesday 20 September 1933.

the cinema; however, the new mobility made possible by the motor car and bus was regarded as welcome and seen to be useful for their own ends. The success of Elim and Jeffreys can be traced, in part, to an ability to provide an alternative, more certain culture to that of the changing society, and yet also to adopt certain of the changes so that their message could be more widely disseminated.

In the discussion of the development of new religious movements, many attempts have been made to define the core elements of sects and their relationship to the world.³²² It is not the intention of this thesis to interact with the plethora of church-sect designations,³²³ but to determine Elim's relation to the world, and in particular, to determine whether this helps to explain Jeffreys' appeal. A cursory reading of material in the Elim Evangel produced during this period would suggest that Elim was, to use Wallis' phrase, a 'world-rejecting movement',³²⁴ evidenced by a very strict holiness code. In particular, the theatre, cinema, dances, smoking and playing cards were all deemed to be inappropriate for Pentecostals.

5.1 The reaction to the popularity of cinema - an example of rejecting the world

Cinema was the new medium in the 1920s. Of all the illicit pleasures denied to members of the Elim churches, the reaction to the cinema was a clear example

³²² For a useful overview of developments in sociological understanding of sects, see York, M. The Emerging Network (London: Rowman and Littlefield, 1995) ch.7.

³²³ The author is in broad agreement with Wilson's description of Elim as a conversionist sect. Wilson, B. 'A Typology of Sects' in R. Robertson, Sociology of Religion (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969), 365.

³²⁴ Wallis, R. The Elementary Forms of New Religious Life, 9-39 in Dawson, L. Cults in Context (Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press, 1996), 62ff.

of rejecting the new possibilities that were offered in the world. Taylor argues that gradually the cinema changed the pattern of English life, in particular, that of the middle classes. Cinemas eclipsed churches and public houses in popularity, spread romantic ideals, and became an external forum where women were free to join their husbands.³²⁵ The number of people that are claimed to have been attending the cinema during this time varies, but Graves and Hodges suggest that in 1919, half the population attended the cinema twice a week.³²⁶ Wilkinson suggests that by 1932, half the population were still attending once a week.³²⁷ The point that all the historians agree on is that the cinema provided a place of escape for those trapped in the drabness of their own lives.³²⁸

However, for Pentecostals the cinema was forbidden territory. It was believed that the atmosphere of the cinema was, in itself, opposed to God, and since the stories portrayed on celluloid appealed to 'baser instincts', attendance would lead to personal degradation.³²⁹ The ministers decided that if any of the congregation did go to cinemas, they would not be allowed to wear their crusader badges.³³⁰ Correspondents to the Elim Evangel suggested that

³²⁵ Taylor, A.J.P. English History, 1914-1945, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 181.

³²⁶ Graves R. and Hodge, A. The Long Weekend: A Social History of Great Britain, 1918-1939 (London: Sphere Books, 1991), 134. Taylor (1965) claims that in Liverpool, at least, 25% went twice a week. 314.

³²⁷ Wilkinson, A. Dissent or Conform: War, Peace and the English Churches 1900-1945, (London: SCM Press, 1986), 65.

³²⁸ Taylor, ((1965) 315) wrote, 'The unemployed man could forget, for a few pence, his harsh surroundings and could move into a world of palatial halls, obsequious servants and marble baths.' Likewise Branson (230) wrote, '[cinema] enabled innumerable people leading cramped and deprived lives to escape into a world of glorious make-believe.'

³²⁹ Parker, P.G. "Why I Do Not", Elim Evangel, 17 July 1936, 451-452.

³³⁰ Minutes of 1934 Ministerial Conference, 20 September 1934. Crusader Badges

believers should not attend the cinema, even to view educational films, for a number of reasons. Firstly, most of the audience would consist of non-Christians, and as Christians they should be separate from them. Secondly, attendance at educational films would lead to an increasing involvement in less 'improving' films; thirdly, the picture theatres were controlled by non-Christian people.³³¹ This 'standard of separation' was undergirded by biblical passages such as 2 Corinthians 6:17³³² and the need to lay aside sins and 'weights' (Hebrews 12:1). 'Weights' were distinguished from sins and so might, to the unsanctified eye, appear morally neutral. However, these innocent pleasures could cause believers to be spiritually lethargic and so also had to be abandoned.³³³

For the Pentecostals, the campaigns and the churches took the social place of the cinema. If the screen had given people the possibility to escape from reality, so the services were opportunities for people to believe that they were part of something greater, with a larger purpose and destiny in which they had a definite part to play. Jeffreys, shrouded in secrecy, was the star.

5.2 Adapting the 'world' to Elim's cause

Notwithstanding the example of the cinema, Elim members would not have recognised themselves as world-rejecters. They rejected the existing social

identified one as a young member of an Elim church.

³³¹ The initial inquiry about the desirability of Christians visiting the cinema was in Elim Evangel, 19 February 1937, 124. The answers were in Elim Evangel, 12 March 1937, 172.

³³² 'Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate.'

³³³ Mason, H.A. "The believer's attitude in a pleasure-loving age" Elim Evangel 5 October 1934, 636.

and religious mores in order to create a renewed version of both. To achieve that end they were aware of the need to 'use' the world. In 1934, the Elim Evangel advised its readers to

use the world so as to gain ultimately the most profit for spirit, soul and body: both for ourselves and for others. The pleasure that is incidental to such use will be right and proper and may be helpful.³³⁴

Jeffreys was applauded as one who was able to accomplish this. A non-Christian couple who were 'pleasure-loving people', as indicated by their proclivity for visiting amusements and engaging in 'worldly practices', such as reading Sunday papers, wanted to take a photograph of Jeffreys. He allowed them to do so. In time they acknowledged that 'they owe their conversion to the fact that Principal George Jeffreys was and is ready to become all things to all men in order to save some'.³³⁵

Martin's comment regarding Latin American Pentecostals, therefore, is apposite to inter-war Elim members,

Pentecostals have dramatically walked out of society in order to construct their own raft, away from the pull of the mainstream and of their past.³³⁶

This abandonment of mainstream society refers equally to their reaction to ecclesiastical structures. Wallis, depicting a world-accommodating religion, argues that it 'restores an experiential element to the spiritual life and thereby replaces lost certainties in a world where religious institutions have become increasingly relativised'.³³⁷ Therefore, in contrast to the assumption that Elim was a world- rejecting religious movement, it is more accurate to suggest that

³³⁴ Editorial, Elim Evangel 31 August 1934, 549.

³³⁵ "Snappers who were snapped for Christ" Elim Evangel 5 February 1932, 86.

³³⁶ Martin, D. Forbidden Revolutions (London: SPCK, 1996), 46.

³³⁷ Wallis in Dawson, 66.

Elim was a world-accommodating religion, operating in the aftermath of the First World War in the midst of a society exhibiting a general lack of confidence in traditional church life. Jeffreys presented himself as an evangelist who could offer people the certainties they craved and create a church context that was new. In short, he presented a revitalised form of fundamentalist Christianity.

Three particular changes in British society were incorporated by Jeffreys into the alternative world that was created: increased mobility, women's emancipation and the popularity of music. By adapting the world to the cause of Elim, Jeffreys allowed people to experience the benefits of the changes in society whilst retaining a safe Christian environment.

One of the most positive innovations of the age was the increased mobility made possible by the development of the motor car and the charabanc. By 1930, one million people in Britain owned a car,³³⁸ and although Jeffreys was one of these, it is unlikely that many in his congregations did.³³⁹ Although the new mobility enabled thousands to enjoy Sundays away from church,³⁴⁰ it helped the growth of Elim, by enabling people to travel to the major meetings by enhanced public transport. Of particular significance were the annual meetings in London, which besides being of spiritual benefit, inculcated a sense of being part of a wider 'family'. Churches travelling together to an event

³³⁸ Taylor, (1965), 302.

³³⁹ At a time when car ownership was relatively uncommon, Boulton seemed eager to defend Jeffreys' owning a car (plate opp. 232). He detailed how the car had been purchased; it was due to the gift of someone who had insisted that money be given 'towards God's work of a car, or NOTHING!' The car was seen to be a 'wonderful testimony to the care of a loving Father over His children'.

³⁴⁰ Wilkinson, (1986), 58. Cf. Latourette, K. S. The Twentieth Century in Europe, vol. IV (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1969), 396.

many miles from their home also strengthened the relationship ties of the local church. Particularly for those from the provinces, many would have never had the chance to visit London apart from these opportunities presented by Jeffreys. Apart from London, Jeffreys targeted the other major cities, aiming to have large churches with people attending who would be willing to use the burgeoning transport system. This increased mobility also coincided with the new freedom enjoyed by women.

Wilson, analysing photographs of the crowds at the evangelistic campaigns and baptismal candidates, accurately pointed out that the women outnumber the men by three to one.³⁴¹ He suggested that this was due to Elim being 'essentially a son religion', and this, combined with the intensity of emotion involved in the worship was more attractive to women who lacked emotional expression in other areas of their lives, than it was to men.³⁴² There is an obvious weakness in this final assumption, that is, that all the women attending the services were experiencing a lack of emotional involvement. However, there is a significance in the imbalance between the sexes, and particularly in the rapid growth amongst the women, which needs to be viewed against the background of the social changes affecting women at that time.

Generally, the 1920's was a period of increasing female emancipation. Although most remained dependant upon male members of the household, there were 1.75 million more women than men in 1921³⁴³ which meant that

³⁴¹ Wilson, 102.

³⁴² Ibid., 104-105.

³⁴³ Taylor, (1965), 166.

many women were forced to manage their own affairs alone. In 1918, Marie Stopes had published Married Love: A Contribution to the Solution of Sex Difficulties. Selling 220,000 copies in five years, this first work dispelled the notion that 'nice' women did not have sexual impulses, and that sex was degrading to pure women.³⁴⁴ In 1923, women were granted equality to present grounds for divorce.³⁴⁵ By 1930, women were ready to campaign against licensing regulations that had hitherto decreed that unaccompanied women were not able to enter public houses or restaurants at night.³⁴⁶

Whilst many of the women attracted to Jeffreys' meetings would probably not have been directly affected by these social changes in women's affairs, the general change in attitude towards the place of women in society meant that it was more acceptable for women to be absent from the home.³⁴⁷ The evangelistic campaigns, particularly those that involved travel to the cities, gave women an alternative form of freedom.³⁴⁸ They were able to enter an alternative world, empowered by the Spirit, and released from the mundane. The revival meetings gave them a period of safe independence from their home and families and a sense of colour and excitement that contrasted with their daily lives.

³⁴⁴ Branson, 215-216.

³⁴⁵ McMillan, J. The Way it Was, 1914-34. (London: William Kimber, 1979), 152.

³⁴⁶ Ibid., 153.

³⁴⁷ In particular, Stopes' work found a wide readership from the 'sophisticated circles in the West End' to the 'women waiting outside pawnshops', who 'whispered and gossiped over a shared copy of The Book, wrapped in brown paper.' Rose, J. Marie Stopes and the Sexual Revolution (London: Faber & Faber, 1992), 119.

³⁴⁸ Certain women also had the opportunity for public recognition in their use of the gifts of the Spirit and preaching. The place of women in the formation of British Pentecostalism is an area worthy of a full study.

Despite limited leisure time, men had always had alternative communities, other than the churches, of which they could be members. The Trade Union meetings, the public houses, and more particularly the football matches, all produced a sense of the dramatic and the spectacular. Priestley's description of football fans' experience of being at a match could easily have referred to the revival meetings.

Football turned you into a member of a new community, all brothers together for an hour and a half, for not only had you escaped from the clanking machinery of this lesser life, from work, wages, rent, dole, sick pay, insurance cards, nagging wives, ailing children, bad bosses, idle workmen, you had escaped into another and altogether more splendid kind of life.³⁴⁹

For women, excluded from formal gatherings such as football, the revival meetings gave them this sense of community, hope and a corporate identity. A pastor described the effect of the national meetings held in London,

People simply live for months in the memory of these days. They are the greatest joys of their lives. Most of these people will feed on the fare given to them today when they return to their dreary surroundings in some London slum, to their work in the factories, in the black towns of the Midlands... During all these months at work they will have something to look forward to - next Easter at the Albert Hall.³⁵⁰

During the 1920s, Edmonton Borough Council banned jazz in the Town Hall, on the grounds that 'jazzing is neither graceful nor dignified.'³⁵¹ Pastor Greenway, writing ten years later, agreed with this assessment and bewailed the acceptance that jazz as a musical form had received amongst the general public:

Jazz! Jazz!! Jazz!!! As though some gloating fiend had inoculated the musical sense of humanity with a vicious St. Vitus serum.³⁵²

³⁴⁹ Priestley, J. B. The Good Companions (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962 [1929]) 4.

³⁵⁰ Landau, 129.

³⁵¹ McMillan, 147.

³⁵² Greenway, H. W. "Syncopated Christianity", Elim Evangel 11 December 1936, 787.

The developments in the arts during this period were viewed as evidence of how far the world was moving away from God. Bradley, writing about the 'modernistic spirit', attributed it to the devil, believing that the 'feeling of repulsion to jazz music and building, freak painting and sculpture, leaves no doubt in the mind of the believer whose master-mind this is'.³⁵³ In this area, Elim was able to provide a safer alternative. The songs and choruses that were sung reflected an earlier taste in music, often that of the music hall or the more restrained rhythm of the waltz. Utilised to induce a 'bright, cheerful mood' into a meeting,³⁵⁴ they provided a rhythmical rejoinder to the newer, perceptibly more dangerous rhythm of jazz. These songs, important to Pentecostals in expressing their corporate faith, reflected the melodies of a more certain age. Edsor explained,

We believe in letting people sing music that is in their ears and had a nice familiar sound. We don't go in for any wild jazzy stuff, but anything pleasant that happens to be in the air might be adopted for a hymn.³⁵⁵

These three areas of rapid social change: travel, female emancipation and music all presented Elim with opportunities to create an alternative world for their converts. This alternative world offered all the benefits of the secular world within a framework that offered emotional and spiritual rewards.

5.3 The social context of Jeffreys' ministry

According to Lloyd, one of the results of the First World War was a deep suspicion that most people had for all institutions, but particularly for any with long traditions.³⁵⁶ The Church of England had played a major role during the

³⁵³ Bradley, J. T. "Modernism or the Present Revolution", Elim Evangel 17 May 1935, 307.

³⁵⁴ Bradley, 44.

³⁵⁵ Landau, 136.

³⁵⁶ Lloyd, R. The Church of England, 1900-1965 (London: SCM, 1966), 242.

war in the perception of many by the blessing of troops who would engage in battle. It was these troops who returned from the war confirmed in their opinion that the vast majority of the leadership in the Church of England were out of touch with ordinary people.³⁵⁷ The soldiers had been mainly of working class background, whereas the chaplains had been from the upper, educated classes. This identification of the Church with the upper-class establishment meant that the Church was partly blamed for the apparent futility of all that the soldiers had witnessed.³⁵⁸

Although in the immediate aftermath of the war, numbers attending church increased, by the mid-1920s all the larger, older and more institutional Church traditions witnessed steady decline.³⁵⁹ This period was marked by spiritual uncertainty, partly the result of 'a series of violent spasms which convulsed economic and social life'.³⁶⁰ These convulsions were epitomised in the chronic depression culminating in an increase in unemployment in 1922, the Miners' Strike and the General Strike of 1926, and the Great Depression of 1929. Many of the chaplains had returned home from the War suffering from 'spiritual fatigue and bewilderment'³⁶¹ to find that people were wanting to find a place of

³⁵⁷ Peacock, H. L. A History of Modern Britain, 1915-1979 (London: Heinemann, 1980⁴), 205.

³⁵⁸ Wilkinson, A. The Church of England and the First World War (London: SCM, 1978), 131.

³⁵⁹ Between 1921-1927 non-conformist church membership increased from 1,962,000 to 2,015,000. However, from 1928-1940, they declined to 1,874,000. The figures for Easter communicants within the Anglican churches numbered 2,410,000 in 1920, and increased to 2,662,000 in 1927. However, by 1940 they had declined to 2,255,000. Currie, R., Gilbert, A., Horsley, L. Churches and Churchgoers, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 31.

³⁶⁰ Wilson, C. First with the News (London: W.H. Smith, 1985), 297.

³⁶¹ Lloyd, 245.

existential security in the changed world they were encountering. Taylor comments, 'Men thought they were living in a disintegrating society.'³⁶²

While the Liberal wing of the Church attempted to respond to these events, with leaders such as Conrad Noel and Studdart Kennedy being hailed as revolutionaries,³⁶³ the Evangelicals, in the face of the onslaught of social change, theological modernism and Higher Criticism, reverted to a purely defensive position.³⁶⁴ They were deemed to have failed during the War, unable to 'cope with the ethical and theological ambiguities encountered in the daily life of the soldier',³⁶⁵ and continued in peace-time involving themselves 'with the old issues as if nothing untoward had happened'.³⁶⁶ Whilst it is true that Elim wanted to shore up its defences against modernism, by turning its attention away from the economic and social conditions of people directly it was able to offer a much more optimistic view of the future. By emphatically not being involved in the arguments concerning the reconstruction of the country, the Pentecostals did not have to interact with the difficult social issues of the day. Jeffreys' and Elim's contribution to British religious life was the provision of a new venue of worship for people who felt dissatisfied with the established churches and the established patterns of worship. Rom Landau, observing Jeffreys praying in the Albert Hall in 1934, claimed to understand why 10,000 people had come to hear him. In Jeffreys' approach to God there was

³⁶² Taylor, (1965), 177.

³⁶³ Oliver, J. The Church and Social Order (London: Mowbray, 1968), 62.

³⁶⁴ Barclay, O. Evangelicalism in Britain, 1935-1995 (Leicester: IVP, 1995), 42-43.

³⁶⁵ Wilkinson, (1978), 234.

³⁶⁶ Ibid., 246.

no complicated mystery. The man who spoke to God in their name did not address him in Latin or in the archaic words of a centuries-old Church.... His prayers were almost colloquial.³⁶⁷

This contrasted directly with J.B. Priestley's experience of attending church at around the same time:

When one considers that we are generally supposed to have plunged or blundered into a new world since the war, that vast changes are taking place in every department of our lives, the likeness between this service and the ones I remember (30 years previously) was astonishing. The organist looked the same, and played the same stuff in the same old way.³⁶⁸

Jeffreys was successful during this period because he was able to offer certainty at a time when the populace were being buffeted by traumatic changes on all sides. However, Jeffreys was not the only evangelist offering the promise, and in Jeffreys' case the apparent delivery, of revival. Revival, amongst many Evangelicals, was being seen to be not only necessary, but also possible. In 1921, Samuel Chadwick announced that the Church was about to experience the greatest revival that the world had ever seen.³⁶⁹ This desire for revival was matched by the increasing number of revivalists ready to minister to the masses alarmed by the events of the day and anxious for answers.

Redwood's acerbic comment crystallised the desperation of the general public,

Even among those who are most articulate in their profession of religious scepticism, (there) are thousands who are pathetically anxious to believe.³⁷⁰

Wickham suggested that, following the war, people were asking questions that

³⁶⁷ Landau, 123.

³⁶⁸ Priestley, J. B. English Journey (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977 [1934]), 105.

³⁶⁹ Randall, I.M. Holiness and Pentecostal Spirituality in Inter-War England. Papers presented to S.P.S. and E.P.C.R.A. Conferences, Mattersey Hall, 10-14 July 1995. No page numbers given.

³⁷⁰ Redwood, H. God in the Slums (London: Hodder & Stoughton, n.d.), 19.

'only a prophetic Christianity at close grips with the secular problems of the age' could answer, and were disappointed when 'the word was not forthcoming'.³⁷¹ Jeffreys provided a form of this 'prophetic Christianity'; ministering during such a disrupted period of British history people were very willing to accept his message. His appeal was in the offer of the exotic novelty of Pentecostalism in the context of the proclamation of the reassuring message of traditional Christianity.

5.4 Jeffreys in the context of a revivalist age

Commenting on the many revivalists operating during the inter-war period, Hastings says,

In their different ways they all expressed something of a sense of the bankruptcy of conventional wisdom, secular or religious, and a rather frenetic search for new solutions.³⁷²

The country seemed ready to respond to the flamboyance of the revivalists, 'revivals were the fashion'.³⁷³ Anything that seemed to offer the exotic and the unknown was able to attract the attention of the public.³⁷⁴ In the "roaring twenties", there was an unquestionable demand for exotic religion. Inge explained this on the grounds that the war had led to an anti-intellectualism.³⁷⁵

Landau's book, God is my Adventure reflected this interest in the esoteric. The

³⁷¹ Wickham, E. R. Church and People in an Industrial City (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957), 191, 204.

³⁷² Hastings, A. A History of English Christianity, 1920-90 (London: SCM, 1991³), 289.

³⁷³ Graves and Hodge, 142.

³⁷⁴ For example, Sadhu Singar Singh, the convert to Christianity was very popular when he visited Britain in the 1920's. In February 1920, he spoke at Westminster Chapel, Metropolitan Tabernacle, St Bride's, Fleet Street and St Matthew's, Westminster. He also preached to 700 clergy, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, at Church House. Later that year he also spoke at The 'Keswick' Convention in Llandrindod Wells. Heiler, F. The Gospel of Sadhu Sundar Singh (E.T.: London: Allen & Unwin, 1927) 80, 85. Spiritualism also increased in popularity during this period. The Krishnamurti, an Eastern syncretistic guru, also attracted a 'large following' in Britain at this time. Graves and Hodge, 201.

³⁷⁵ Inge, W.R. Lay Thoughts of a Dean (London: Hutchinson and Sons, 1926), 304.

second edition explained the appeal of the book, 'many other people, disillusioned by the churches, were only too willing to delve into the ways and methods of unorthodox schools of thought.'³⁷⁶ His book included descriptions of Count Keyserling, and his 'School of Wisdom'; Stefan George and Bo Yin Ra; Rudolf Steiner; Krishnamurti; Sri Meher Baba; Frank Buchman; P.D. Ouspensky; Gurdjieff; and George Jeffreys.

Jeffreys, with his charismatic personality, his oratory and his healing ministry, obviously fitted into this context; in particular, this national sentiment would explain why Jeffreys was so keen to establish a ministerial relationship with Aimee Semple McPherson. McPherson's ability to draw a crowd in America was largely because, in many ways, she was a bigger star than the Hollywood film stars. Using her rhetorical skills, her sensuality, and her creative use of narrative preaching complete with tableaux, she was a 'safe' star;³⁷⁷ Blumhofer explains, 'she touched their (American Protestant) emotions without apparently jeopardising their souls.'³⁷⁸ Anthony Quinn worked as McPherson's translator as a young adult. Reflecting on his relationship with her, he said,

Years later, when I saw the great actresses at work, I would compare them to her... Ingrid Bergman... Katherine Hepburn... Greta Garbo... they all fell short of that electric shock that Aimee Semple McPherson produced in me.³⁷⁹

In England, however, she may not have had the same enduring impact simply because her image was too close to that of the celluloid heroes. Jeffreys had

³⁷⁶ Ibid., 7.

³⁷⁷ Taylor, (1994), 105. Taylor relates that he saw rare film footage of McPherson preaching at the Angelus Temple in 1936 and was struck by her 'powerful oratory and striking beauty'.

³⁷⁸ Blumhofer, E.L. Everybody's Sister, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 230.

³⁷⁹ Quinn in Epstein, D.M. Sister Aimee: The Life of Aimee Semple McPherson (Orlando, FL: D.M. Epstein, 1993), 378.

been impressed with her ministry and after visiting the Angelus Temple in 1924 he adopted her church's 'Foursquare Gospel' tag for the Elim churches.³⁸⁰ She visited London and spoke at Elim meetings held at the Surrey Tabernacle in March 1926,³⁸¹ returning a month later to speak at the Easter conventions at the Royal Albert Hall.³⁸² This was the first time that Elim had booked this venue, and it is likely that it was McPherson's presence there which attracted the large crowds and consequently gave Jeffreys confidence to preach there in later years without a guest speaker. However, overall, she did not have the same appeal or impact as she had in America. Although the Elim publications gave her much print-space, particularly at the time of her 'kidnapping',³⁸³ her impact on the general public, particularly on her final visit to London in 1928, was minimal; people were 'more curious than fervent'.³⁸⁴ Clearly, her flamboyance was too blatant for the English church-goers.³⁸⁵ However, the relationship between McPherson and Jeffreys seems to have been of great significance. Certainly, they were close enough for McPherson's mother to invite Jeffreys to become the pastor of the Temple at the time of McPherson's disappearance. The actual nature of their relationship may never be

³⁸⁰ Ibid., 279-280, cf Cartwright, 80. Boulton, E.C.W. Elim Supplement October 1924, 47 reported the visit made by George and Stephen Jeffreys, Boulton, Darragh and McWhirter to the Angelus Temple, where they heard her preaching the 'foursquare gospel'.

³⁸¹ Kingston, C. "Mrs. Aimee Semple McPherson in London." Elim Evangel, 15 March 1926, 61.

³⁸² Blumhofer, (1993), 280.

³⁸³ Jeffreys, G. "A Tribute to Sister McPherson", Elim Evangel 1 June 1926, 122; "Aimee Semple McPherson Kidnapped", Elim Evangel 15 September 1926, 206-216; "God's Mighty Deliverance", Elim Evangel 1 February 1927, 41. News reports appeared in the Foursquare Revivalist on 14 September 1928, 4, "A great woman's tribulation"; 21 September 1928, 1, "Great American Tribute to Sister McPherson"; 5 October 1928, 6, Denney, J.B. "The Real Perjurers Unmasked"; 19 October 1928, 1, "Close of a Triumphant Week in London"; 16 November 1928, 1, "Closing days of a Great Campaign".

³⁸⁴ Blumhofer, (1993), 313.

³⁸⁵ For example, Edsall relates how Jeffreys had to stop her throwing flowers out to the congregation during one of her sermons. Interview, op. cit.

determined exactly. In the late 1980s, all the letters between Jeffreys and McPherson were destroyed by Edsor.³⁸⁶ Significantly, Jeffreys' self-confidence as a revivalist increased with McPherson's visit, and allowed him to gain public prominence during a period when people were ready to accept the Pentecostal message.

6. Conclusion

Overall, the revivalism of Jeffreys, and the life of the Elim churches, provided people with a completely separate existence. This alternative world was safer than the uncertainty of the secular age. It had its own distinct emotional experiences that were deemed to be of sufficient significance for people never to have to enter back into the 'world' again. This was particularly significant during a time when there were so many changes and uncertainties being experienced by the general public. Jeffreys found a hearing at a time when people were looking for an alternative spirituality to that of the established church. Elim produced a 'substitute society'.³⁸⁷ This society took elements of the changing prevailing culture and channelled it into the safety and excitement of an alternative world. Jeffreys' theological understanding of his place in God's economy provides some of the reasons for the appeal of Jeffreys to the crowds of people who came to hear him preach the message of salvation. The effect of his evangelistic success encouraged Jeffreys to believe that he was vindicated by God to reformulate the denomination that had been created by his own evangelistic ministry. This thesis, whilst not wishing to deny that

³⁸⁶ Ibid.

³⁸⁷ For a comparison with contemporary Pentecostalism in Latin America, see D. Martin Tongues of Fire (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 258.

Jeffreys was charismatic in both the theological and Weberian sense, suggests that his success was partly dependant on the emerging social conditions of the inter-war period and therefore was not simply a divine vindication of every aspect of his beliefs and practices.

4 George Jeffreys' relationships

Thus far, the thesis has argued that in the development of Jeffreys' ministry and theology there are reasons that may reasonably be presented to indicate that the final split was not as a result of the presenting issues alone. It has been suggested that Jeffreys' character accounts for many of the problems that later became evident. This final section examining the implicit factors contributing to the split will concentrate on Jeffreys' relationships. His relationship with his brother, Stephen, will be detailed to demonstrate that Jeffreys had experienced a severe breakdown in a close relationship prior to the problems with Phillips. The second section will investigate Jeffreys' relationship with the Revival Party, significant since these men were his primary supporters. The third, and largest, section will examine his relationship with Phillips. This is a key relationship. Consequently, some description of Phillips' character will be given. This will enable the reader appreciate more fully the arguments over the specific issues which will follow.

1. His relationship with his brother, Stephen

George Jeffreys supplied few, if any, direct references to his family. There is little evidence to suggest that he maintained close contact with any of his family. Apart from a few remarks concerning his mother, for whom he felt some responsibility,³⁸⁸ the family relationship that is best documented is the one between George and Stephen. In assessing the breakdown of Jeffreys' relationships with Elim, his relationship with his brother is interesting since that relationship deteriorated to the extent that the two brothers became unable to maintain contact with one another. Since this was paralleled in Jeffreys' relationship with Phillips, it is legitimate to investigate any possible similarities between the two situations in order to assess whether any aspects of Jeffreys' character precipitated these relationship problems.

This turbulent relationship involved two brothers whose personalities were antithetical to one another. George had been a weak child and always unlikely to go down the mines; in contrast, Stephen had worked in the mines between 1889 and 1912. George was organised and meticulous about appearance and

³⁸⁸ See for example, "Christmas and New Year Greetings" Elim Evangel 25 December 1929, 530. In an editorial entitled, "Is Principal George Jeffreys Rich?" (Elim Evangel, 28 June 1935, 410) the fact that he owned a small house in Wales, and part of a house in London was outlined. The support that he was able to give to his mother and family, they being portrayed as entirely dependent on him, was credited as being evidence of God's faithfulness. However, Jeffreys' own care was praised, 'Those who were privileged to visit his mother before she died never came away without hearing testimony to the faithfulness of her boy who regularly sent the money, however small, to meet the needs of the house'. There is no evidence indicating whether he regularly visited her.

See also a possible veiled reference to his own family situation in a letter discussing the needs of unmarried ministers. He said that it would be a 'sore point' for him if he had to be 'doomed to lodgings eternally simply because I felt called to the unmarried state, more especially if I had to send money to a mother or a sister dependant upon me, knowing that this was from the reduced allowance granted me because I was unmarried!' Letter Jeffreys to Phillips, 19 March 1936.

impressions made on others; Stephen was completely disorganised, regularly double-booking himself to preach at two different venues simultaneously.³⁸⁹

Publicly, George had a calming, authoritative presence and was unwilling to engage in encouraging excessive enthusiasm amongst the congregation; Stephen was more likely to encourage the congregation to ecstatic heights.

Adams reported that,

In his exuberance he often jumps and dances. Sometimes, and I believe quite unconsciously, his voice rises and falls in the cadence of a spontaneous chant. He can rouse his great meetings almost to a frenzy: he can lull them with a whisper.³⁹⁰

An anonymous report of meetings held in Grimsby in summer 1922 described how thousands heard 'the fiery, earnest passionate appeals of Pastor Stephen, and the calmer, deeper thoughts and helpful Bible studies of Pastor George'.³⁹¹

According to Gee, George's preaching was 'logical and lucid'.³⁹² Because the two brothers were so dissimilar it was believed that they had different fathers.³⁹³

For many this explained the fundamental differences between the brothers.

However, whilst it is true that Kezia Jeffreys did remarry after the death of her first husband, this took place in 1916.

They began by working closely together; in 1912, Stephen asked George to leave the Bible School in Preston after only three months, to help him minister

³⁸⁹ Kay (1990), 50. In 1925 Phillips wrote to Jeffreys complaining of the lack of care that Stephen was giving the converts in Barking, due to the absence of organisation. 'It is a pity there is not someone like Mr Darragh to organise with your brother.' Letter 23 January 1925.

³⁹⁰ Adams, A. Stephen Jeffreys (London: Covenant Publishing Co. 1928), 16. Boddy (A., Confidence March 1913, 47) noticed the same characteristic of Stephen, 'He was most earnest while he almost chanted or sang'.

³⁹¹ "Pentecostal Preachers draw the multitudes", Elim Evangel June 1922, 87.

³⁹² Gee, D. "George Jeffreys", Pentecost March-May 1962, 11.

³⁹³ This rumour was firmly held, being repeated to the writer in 1997 by M. Phillips (Interview, 4 March 1997, Birkenhead). The full details of the Jeffreys brothers' parents are as follows: Father: Thomas Jeffreys, b. 1848, d. 3 September 1895. Mother: Kezia (nee Brown), b. 6 July 1851, d. 31 July 1929.

in Cwmtwrch, Swansea. However, their relationship soon deteriorated.

Cartwright suggests that there were two reasons for the relationship breakdown. One concerned their temperamental differences; the other involved the part that others played in their problems.³⁹⁴ By 1925, it was clear that there were serious problems in their relationship. In January, Phillips wrote to George complaining of Stephen's unwillingness to provide care for the new converts.³⁹⁵ In February, George complained of the damage that others were inflicting on their relationship. He referred to a letter he had received from 'Mr N. full of condemnation of all kinds of things'.³⁹⁶ Apparently Mr N. stayed all night with Stephen and George believed that it was people such as he, the 'opposers of Elim', who were 'ministering to him [Stephen]'.³⁹⁷ By the summer, George was very eager to have the title deeds of the Elim property from Stephen, so that the work would be protected if Stephen left.³⁹⁸ In October he wrote,

Stephen's attitude is simply draining every drop of spiritual life out of me. His wife has written me the most terrible and disgraceful letter and I am misrepresented on all hands. The test is really getting too much and I don't know where things are going to end ... I cannot get five minutes to study my Bible, and still am expected to feed peoples' souls and huge congregations hanging on my words. I am practically heartbroken, indeed I am.³⁹⁹

At this stage, George recognised that their relationship was about to end. He wrote to Henderson about the 'threatenings' that Stephen and his wife were

³⁹⁴ Cartwright, 63.

³⁹⁵ Letter Phillips to Jeffreys, 23 January 1925.

³⁹⁶ Probably Ludwig Naumann, one of the men who in the latter part of 1925 attempted to reconcile the two men. Cartwright, 62. Naumann also attempted to mediate between Jeffreys and Phillips in 1941. His letter was printed, and replied to, in The Pattern October 1941, 6,7. If it was Naumann, in the light of his later attempts at reconciliation, it is possible that George over-reacted to his intervention, alleging that Naumann was 'anti-Elim' when he may only have expressed some legitimate concerns.

³⁹⁷ Letter Jeffreys to Phillips, 11 February 1925.

³⁹⁸ Letter Jeffreys to W. Henderson, 26 August 1925. There is an irony here: in 1940 George would withhold the title deeds from Elim, to their constant irritation.

³⁹⁹ Letter Jeffreys to W. Henderson, 21 October 1925.

'breathing' against him, and suggested that 'Stephen is about to leave and join up with others in the City' [London]. He complained that he was being 'called every name that can be found in the dictionary and more'.⁴⁰⁰ This marked the final break in their relationship.

Jeffreys framed the conflict with his brother in terms of persecution, a 'test' and reflected on his need to continue his own ministry. He felt that the arguments were a distraction from his obligations to the congregations, 'hanging on my words'. In reality, he created and sustained these obligations by manoeuvring himself into a position of sole leadership. The conflict is described in such a way to highlight George's martyrdom. This will be a theme repeated in the later conflict with Phillips.

In November 1925, Henderson attempted to mediate between the two brothers and organised a committee to ensure that Stephen could operate in a relationship of accountability to Elim.⁴⁰¹ However, this failed after another disagreement between them. Henderson wrote to Phillips,

I don't know how Pastor Stephen got at his brother again. They must have met and had words or had correspondence. This, of course, will be the ruin of both and the work if allowed to continue.⁴⁰²

He concluded his letter by suggesting that an agreement be signed by George that he would not contact Stephen again, assuring Phillips, 'I don't know what hold Pastor Stephen could get on his brother again'.⁴⁰³

⁴⁰⁰ Letter Jeffreys to W. Henderson, 30 October 1925.

⁴⁰¹ Cartwright, 62.

⁴⁰² Letter W. Henderson to Phillips, 12 November 1925.

⁴⁰³ Ibid.

There is another parallel here with the conflict in 1940. In 1925, there was a fear that the failing relationship with his brother would ruin their own respective ministries and would also destroy the churches. Although this did not happen in 1925, in the aftermath of the later conflict with Phillips in 1940 Jeffreys' ministry was severely debilitated and Elim was almost destroyed.

Stephen linked up with the Assemblies of God, and for a time there was the unfortunate spectacle of Stephen and George appearing to be in competition with each other, ministering in areas very close to each other, causing a division of interest and support amongst their supporters.⁴⁰⁴ That they were determined to continue this policy suggests a rugged belligerence in both brothers. In February 1926, Boulton wrote to Phillips about the situation. He pointed to the influence of leaders who were opposed to Elim,

There is little doubt but that Pastor Stephen in refusing to identify himself with the Foursquare Gospel Churches has acted upon the advice of Pentecostal leaders who are opposed to the Alliance.⁴⁰⁵

The brothers seem not to have kept in touch with each other, as can be illustrated by the fact that in the thirties, a rumour spread that Stephen had died. When it reached George, he simply said he had not heard, but that if the informant could verify that the story was true then George would appreciate being told. Cartwright explains this strange reaction as being a relationship of trust, whereby each could give the other the space they needed.⁴⁰⁶ This seems unrealistic. The reality is less noble. The reply reveals a hardened

⁴⁰⁴ In 1929 George wrote to churches in the East End of London, warning them that Stephen had declared that he was going to open churches close to Elim's. Cartwright, 64.

⁴⁰⁵ Letter E.C.W. Boulton to Phillips, 16 February 1926.

⁴⁰⁶ Cartwright, 19.

callousness; the relationship had broken down irretrievably and, even in death, George Jeffreys showed no regret. The breach had happened between the brothers when Stephen was a successful evangelist and when George was beginning to build a strong base in England.⁴⁰⁷ In many senses, the brothers' ministries were too similar and their characters too dissimilar. Both were noted evangelists,⁴⁰⁸ both saw amazing healings, both were hugely successful and neither could work in tandem with the other. The attempt to remain singularly dominant within the growing denomination could only be maintained by one of the two successful evangelists. On this occasion, George remained the leader.

Inevitably, it is difficult to appreciate fully the emotions, or even the full causes, of this conflict. However, what is clear is that the problems persisted and the rift was very deep. For example, when the book written by Edward Jeffreys about his father, Stephen, was about to be published, the Jeffreys family, led by George, wrote to Edward demanding to know the contents of the book. This suggests that there were fears concerning the possibility that the unpleasantness of the past would be resurrected and displayed to the readers. In the context of this thesis it is clear that the problem that Jeffreys would later face with Phillips was not an isolated case of his problems in relationships.

The problems with his brother, resulting in them competing to attract the same

⁴⁰⁷ An interesting indication of the state of their relationship is that when Agnes Adams wrote her book, which was published in 1928 and written closely with Stephen (23) it contained no reference to George at all.

⁴⁰⁸ For example, Cartwright, 69, reports Stephen's campaign in Sunderland in September 1927, when 3,000 attended the services, with many not being able to enter the building. In the space of a month 3,362 converts were recorded. Following these meetings, 1554 converts were counted in two weeks in meetings at Spennymoor, Co. Durham; Chesterfield saw 1554 in three weeks; Bury, 2042 in three weeks. For further details, see Jeffreys, E., 69-84.

crowds of followers, would be repeated with Phillips, when the struggle was for the control of ministers and churches.

2. Jeffreys and the Revival Party

The initial concept of the Elim Evangelistic Band was simple. Workers would join Jeffreys in Ireland, aid him in his mission, and be placed in churches once these had been established. However, it soon became clear that within the group of workers, there was a need for Jeffreys to have a more permanent group - those who would be able to organise his evangelistic meetings, arrange transport for him, lead the singing at his meetings and ensure that follow-up took place amongst his converts. It was this group that became known as the Revival Party.

Jeffreys never married, nor, as far as can be ascertained, proposed to anyone. It is possibly due to this that he was able to encourage the tremendous loyalty of a small group of men all his life. They looked to him for their cause, their place in society and their finance. The first worker to join Jeffreys in Ireland was Robert Ernest Darragh. He had attended Bible School in Preston in 1914, returning to Bangor, Northern Ireland in February 1915. He became a member of the Evangelistic Band later that year.⁴⁰⁹ Darragh never married and lived

⁴⁰⁹ He was accepted into the Band on 3 July 1915. Greenway, H. W. "Homecall of Pastor R.E. Darragh" Elim Evangel 28 March 1959, 199. See also Boulton, 29, Cartwright, 44. This date contradicts the one referred to on his ordination certificate, issued on 13 October 1918, 'Previous to this ordination our Brother had been a regular Minister of Religion under the auspices of Elim Pentecostal Alliance since the year of our Lord 1914, during which time he had successfully ministered in its various churches'. This was signed by Jeffreys, and the following deacons James Hetherington, Edward Ridge and George Gillespie. The date on the ordination certificate is not accurate since the Elim Evangelistic Band was not in existence until 7 January 1915. The Minute Book does not contain any reference to Darragh until July 1915.

with Jeffreys for 44 years. Although he was the first minister of the church at Clapham, his primary role was as the song-leader in Jeffreys' meetings.⁴¹⁰ He died on 28 February 1959.⁴¹¹ When Jeffreys died in 1962, his body was placed in Darragh's grave in Streatham Cemetery. This action had been previously planned by Darragh and Jeffreys.⁴¹²

The other long-serving member of the Revival party was James McWhirter. He had the organisational role in the Party, and was also the deputy preacher for Jeffreys. He was converted at the age of 19, at a service held by Jeffreys in Belfast.⁴¹³ He was single until 1936, when, due to his marriage, his relationship with the Revival Party began to weaken.⁴¹⁴ He explained, 'After my marriage in 1936 the close relationship of the bachelor party friendship could quite naturally not be continued.'⁴¹⁵ He finally resigned from the Party in 1957 due to his increasingly divergent theological views.⁴¹⁶ The emotional security that Jeffreys may have received in a marriage partnership was provided by members of the Revival Party, to the extent when they got married, their relationship with Jeffreys inevitably changed.

⁴¹⁰ Francis, G.I. "Three Powerful Easter Monday Meetings" The Pattern May 1959, 8.

⁴¹¹ Greenway, H. W. "Homecall of Pastor R.E. Darragh" Elim Evangel 28 March 1959, 199. This date was the 70th birthday of George Jeffreys.

⁴¹² For a photograph of their grave see Edsor, (1964), facing 135.

⁴¹³ McWhirter, J. "Beyond Compare" Elim Evangel 19 June 1936, 395.

⁴¹⁴ After his marriage he seemed more willing to accept invitations to minister alone; for example, in 1938 he went to Australia to minister for a period. "George Jeffreys and his Revival Party" Elim Evangel 25 December 1938, 802.

⁴¹⁵ Letter J. McWhirter to Justus du Plessis, 9 December 1975.

⁴¹⁶ In an autobiographical sketch, McWhirter, (J. Every Barrier Swept Away (Cardiff: Megiddo Press, 1983) 1) would later write, 'Rather than meandering through my experience, let me put it in a nutshell: from ultra-fundamentalism to liberal evangelicalism.'

Albert Edsor was the youngest member of the Party and has remained the constant defender of Jeffreys' ministry. At the age of 17, he was employed in a music shop in Brighton. Jeffreys was coming to the close of a ten-week mission in Brighton when Edsor attended one of the final meetings; because the crowds were so large, Edsor had to sit on the platform. During the service he responded to the call for conversion. At the end of the service, Jeffreys, Darragh, McWhirter and Bell, the pianist at the time, wanted to sing a quartet and asked if anyone could play the piano. Edsor responded and accompanied them. After the service he was asked to play the piano regularly at the new church in Brighton, which he did until September 1928 when he became Jeffreys' permanent pianist and driver.⁴¹⁷ Unmarried until the year after Jeffreys' death, Edsor became Jeffreys' secretary, monitoring closely the discussions concerning the proposed changes in church government.

Amongst these people, in particular, Jeffreys commanded immense devotion. Both Darragh and Edsor stayed with Jeffreys all his life, and remained members of his Revival Party until Jeffreys' death. It seems probable that, at times, other ministers were suspicious of the Revival Party. Ultimately they believed that Jeffreys had been manipulated by the Revival Party into making a decisive break with Elim.⁴¹⁸ In assessing causes of the alienation between Jeffreys and Elim, the significance of the Revival Party needs to be noted. These men devoted themselves to Jeffreys; their lives revolved around supporting Jeffreys' ministry; they protected him from the attacks of critics.

⁴¹⁷ Edsor, Interview, op. cit.

⁴¹⁸ Cartwright, D. Telephone Conversation 11 June 1997. Edsor acknowledges that he was aware of this, Interview, op. cit.

Although Landau inquired about Jeffreys' private life when he interviewed Edsor in 1934, the information he received was extremely scant. In reality, we know very little concerning Jeffreys' private life. His early life was engrossed in Revival campaigns and the latter period of his life was consumed solely with the reorganisation of the church. These dominant themes have overwhelmed any awareness that one might gain of his personal life. He was tenaciously protected from the outside world by his Revival Party and was shy to a marked degree. This has led to a dearth of material on Jeffreys the man. For example, replying to the question about Jeffreys' reading material, Edsor said that he only read books concerning religious subjects, and that the major part of his time was spent reading the Bible. Edsor claimed that in the six years that he had been working for Jeffreys, he had not heard him speak of the theatre, art or politics.⁴¹⁹

The one pleasure Jeffreys did enjoy was being driven through the countryside when he was on holiday.⁴²⁰ Although Jeffreys never flew, he did travel extensively abroad. This was a part of his life that was totally separate from his ministry with Elim in England.⁴²¹ Edsor claimed that most of the time not spent evangelising was devoted to writing: articles, books,⁴²² letters to supporters, letters to Phillips,⁴²³ and ultimately the vast number of pamphlets that were

⁴¹⁹ Landau, 136.

⁴²⁰ This was exactly the same information that Edsor supplied over 60 years later. Interview, op. cit.

⁴²¹ This is an area worthy of further research. Generally, Elim people were unaware of Jeffreys' activities and impact in Europe.

⁴²² However, there were only four of these and most of the material for the books came from sermons or articles that had previously appeared in the Elim Evangel.

⁴²³ There were letters sent every day and sometimes more than one letter was sent on the same day.

published from 1939 onwards. When he was campaigning, there were meetings held every night for weeks at a time. After time to prepare for these services, and the need he had to keep abreast with the wider work, there was not much free time.⁴²⁴

It was inevitable that Jeffreys would assume that the reaction of the Revival Party to him represented a universal reaction and to regard their approval as identical with that of the ministers within Elim. Jeffreys was greatly mistaken.

3. Jeffreys' relationship with Ernest John Phillips

In discussions concerning the breakdown between Jeffreys and Elim, attention has centred exclusively on the actions, and by implication, the personality of George Jeffreys.⁴²⁵ However, little attention has been given to E.J. Phillips. His persona has been caricatured either as a bureaucratic establishment figure, who tried to oust the charismatic Jeffreys,⁴²⁶ or, as a skilled administrator who saved the Movement from potential disaster.⁴²⁷ Little has been written about him as a man, or as one of the leaders of the Movement, although his personality and his relationship with Jeffreys is crucial. However, similar to the problems in investigating Jeffreys' life, there is very little material from which to reconstruct his character. Phillips seems to have been totally engrossed by the

⁴²⁴ Edsor, Interview, op. cit.

⁴²⁵ See, for example, Hollenweger's treatment of the split.

⁴²⁶ Cf. Brooks (53), 'The prophetic controversy ... was providential. It served to bring home the lesson of all history, that clerical central control tends towards tyranny.'

⁴²⁷ Greenway, H.W. "Well done ... faithful servant", Elim Evangel 22 September 1973, 3.

work of overseeing the Elim work and appears not to have had time to enjoy life as a private individual.

3.1 A brief biographical sketch of Phillips

Before the relationship between Jeffreys and Phillips is examined, Phillips' biographical details will be presented. Phillips began his ministerial career in 1912 when, at the same time as Jeffreys, he became a student at the Pentecostal Missionary Union Bible College in Preston. He followed this period of training by leading a small Pentecostal group in Tamworth from 1916 to 1919. On Armistice Day, 1919, Jeffreys visited him in Tamworth.⁴²⁸ He was asked by Jeffreys to join the Elim Evangelistic Band in Ireland, which consisted of 15 members. Greenway noted that Phillips was healed of a throat infection at this time, which Phillips interpreted to mean that God had healed him to preach the gospel and to do that with Jeffreys.⁴²⁹ It is possible that Phillips had experienced doubts at that time regarding the wisdom of joining Jeffreys. In 1969, he said that one of the things that made him hesitate joining Jeffreys was that, 'My ideas on church government at that time were not altogether in line

⁴²⁸ Phillips, E.J. "Tribute to one of Britain's Greatest Evangelists", Elim Evangel 17 February 1962, 104. This dating seems to be contradicted by an article written about the Tamworth church, Parsons, P. "Focus on Tamworth", Elim Evangel 12 July 1975, 4-5. Parsons wrote that Phillips was employed by Lord Lichfield, and was joined by his parents in Tamworth in 1918/19 soon after Phillips had gone there. They attended the Cottage Mission, a small gospel mission that had been open since the 1890s, and within a short time Ernest and Hubert, his brother, took over the leadership of the mission. I suspect that the account given by Phillips is the correct one for two reasons. Firstly, it is more reasonable to suppose that Phillips knew the correct chronology, everything we know of his character would suggest that he would be accurate in his account; secondly, Parsons did get some of the other minor details wrong and was corrected by Frederic Phillips in a subsequent edition (16 August 1975, 5). The Elim Evangel was printed in Tamworth, until the Elim Publishing Company was set up in Clapham in 1924.

⁴²⁹ Greenway, H.W. "Well done ... faithful servant", Elim Evangel 22 September 1973, 3.

with those of Pastor Jeffreys'.⁴³⁰ If this reflection on events that took place fifty years previously is accurate, the fact that he had been healed would have been taken as a sign of God's direction, overruling any natural disinclination he may have felt to join Jeffreys. Phillips joined the Band officially on 1 December 1919. On the first day of 1920 he became the pastor of the church at Armagh. Because there was a Cardinal resident in Armagh, Jeffreys gave Phillips the sobriquet 'Cardinal'.⁴³¹ This became Jeffreys' mode of addressing Phillips in all his letters; in reply, Phillips' would call Jeffreys 'Prince', short for 'Principal'. This continued until the relationship broke down irretrievably. Phillips later reflected on these days in Armagh as being 'days of heaven-sent revival'.⁴³²

In 1922, Phillips became the joint-editor with E.W. Hare of the Elim Evangel, and when Hare left the Movement the following year,⁴³³ he became the sole editor for a period, and then joint-editor with Boulton from March 1923 until 1930.⁴³⁴ During the period of Jeffreys' burgeoning success in Britain, they operated as a close team - Jeffreys was the public face of Elim, Phillips supplied that Movement with the news, teaching and direction it needed through the editorship of the magazine.

⁴³⁰ Phillips, E.J. "A Notable Jubilee", Elim Evangel 15 November 1969, 765.

⁴³¹ Smith, J. "He never shirked any duty", Elim Evangel 22 September 1973, 4.

⁴³² Phillips, E.J. "A Notable Jubilee", Elim Evangel 15 November 1969, 765.

⁴³³ The announcement was made in Elim Evangel July 1922, 108, although no mention was made for the reasons for his departure, simply explaining that Hare 'felt the call of God to other work'. In a subsequent article, ("Ultimate Reconciliation Examined", Elim Evangel May 1924, 106-109) Hare alluded to the fact that after he had left Ireland he had encountered Universalism. Although he was involved with a group that taught this, he had not taught it publicly and after further reflection had come to the conclusion that it was heresy.

⁴³⁴ Elim Evangel March 1923, 38.

On 1 August 1923, Phillips became the Secretary-General of the work,⁴³⁵ a post he held until 1 September 1957. He had entered the Movement at a time when there were 'no accounts, no list of properties, the situation was hopeless'⁴³⁶ and developed the infrastructure of the Movement to the extent that it survived the loss of its founder and became a stable denomination. His career with Elim also saw him functioning in the roles of Dean of the Bible College (January 1926 - May 1927); Director of the Publishing Company (1924 onwards) and President of the Crusader Youth (from 1924). In 1957-58, he was elected as the President of the Movement.⁴³⁷ From 1957 to 1964 he remained on the Executive Council in an advisory capacity. His life was dominated by the Elim Movement and he served it with remarkable devotion.⁴³⁸

Phillips took the task of administering and consolidating the Movement very seriously. He was commended for his diligence and in later years the significance of this was not overlooked by those who had been involved in the split. Yet, almost inevitably, because of his administrative ability and clarity of mind, he was viewed as being 'austere to the point of cold', with some thinking

⁴³⁵ This date is taken from the official Elim records held at Cheltenham. There seems to be some confusion about this date. Bradley records that he became the Secretary-General in 1921. Bradley, J.T. "Editorial", Elim Evangel 15 September 1973, 2. Cartwright wrote that he became Secretary-General in January 1922. Cartwright, D. "A New Year - A New Look", Elim Evangel 3 January 1976, 8. The Elim Evangel made no official declaration, only recording that Phillips had moved from Armagh to Belfast, August 1923, 168. The differences may exist because Phillips functioned as Secretary-General before the role was officially created. In Elim Evangel, January 1925, 11, he is listed with George and Stephen Jeffreys, Henderson and Boulton as one of the overseers. By 1929, however, he was described as the Secretary-General, "Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance" Elim Evangel 25 December 1929, 547.

⁴³⁶ Phillips, E.J. Appendix 1.

⁴³⁷ This was an annual position offered as an honour to senior ministers, it was a non-governmental post.

⁴³⁸ 'His devotion was complete'. Greenway, op. cit.

that he was 'too pernickety'.⁴³⁹ Walker described him as rather 'aquiline' in appearance.⁴⁴⁰ The overall impression that Phillips gave to those who saw him was summed up in the phrase 'Pentecost with dignity'.⁴⁴¹ In 1982, Wright wrote a series of articles about the emergence of the Restoration churches. He posed the hypothetical question whether the early leaders in Elim would have felt able to be involved in the new styles of worship. Jeffreys and Darragh, he assumed, would have been very happy in these situations, Joseph Smith would have distinguished between the helpful practices and those excesses that should be avoided while Boulton would have encouraged restraint. He felt Phillips would not have raised his hands in worship, nor shaken hands with people in a 'welcome time',⁴⁴² but, 'He would stand erect, calm, poised, dignified, apparently unaffected by the swirling waters with his heart reaching out to God in prayer ever loyal to the work he loved'.⁴⁴³ This was the image that people who saw him from a distance received; at least outwardly, a most unemotional Pentecostal.

The contact that most pastors had with Phillips was either through correspondence with Headquarters, when his letters could seem brusque in their efficiency, or in the Conference debates. In these settings he was a brilliant debater. As will be seen, he faced John Leech, K.C. in the debate over

⁴³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁰ Letter, T.W. Walker to author, 25 September 1996. Walker worked at Headquarters as an assistant to E.J. Phillips from 1945 for just over 5 years.

⁴⁴¹ A phrase used as a compliment, describing the balanced view that Elim took towards spiritual gifts.

⁴⁴² An opportunity given during the service to welcome fellow worshippers: the equivalent of 'sharing the peace'.

⁴⁴³ Wright, G. "Is the "New" really new? part 4", Elim Evangel 26 June 1982, 6-7. Wright was a senior minister who had known all five men.

British Israelism in 1934, and defeated him; later, in his attacks on George Jeffreys he was able to marshal and deliver his arguments in a devastating manner. Because of his position as Secretary-General, he was always given the privilege of speaking last, and if he felt any proposition was not beneficial for the Movement, he would systematically demolish the arguments line by line. This ability contributed to the image of him being a cold, aloof leader. Walker reflected, 'He was quite brilliant, and grew to be deeply respected, but almost feared in Conference.'⁴⁴⁴

3.2 Similarities with Jeffreys

There are a number of significant similarities between Jeffreys and Phillips. Both were shy, determined, devoted to the Movement and its development, and both suffered periods of severe illness. These similarities will be examined, with particular regard to the way that they affected the problems that were to be experienced within the Movement.

Molly Phillips described her husband as 'very quiet', and recognised that some people could not relate to that. 'They thought he should have been a bit more lively and boisterous, but he had a quiet, reserved manner.'⁴⁴⁵ Significantly, Jeffreys was described by Edsor in similar terms: shy, reserved and even aloof, and therefore apt to be misunderstood when met by the general public.⁴⁴⁶ That both were ill at ease socially resulted in many misunderstandings concerning the issues that would be debated between them.

⁴⁴⁴ Letter, T.W. Walker to author, 25 September 1996.

⁴⁴⁵ Phillips, M. Interview, op. cit.

⁴⁴⁶ Edsor, Interview, op. cit.

The circumstances, generally unknown, surrounding his proposal and marriage to Molly Smith⁴⁴⁷ reveal another aspect to Phillips' character. Phillips married on 12 November 1936, at the age of 43 years. This surprised many people who had assumed him to be a life-long bachelor, solely committed to the work he was involved in. However, most were unaware that he had proposed to his future wife ten years previously and been turned down by her. At that time, she was only 19 years old. After he had proposed to her, she had sought God's guidance by opening the Bible at random and looking for a suitable command.⁴⁴⁸ After doing this, she felt that God did not want her to marry him. He accepted this from her, though disagreed with her that it was God's will. He simply asked that she would tell him if she ever changed her mind in the future. Ten years later, he approached her again, and this time she accepted his proposal and they married that year.⁴⁴⁹

His willingness to wait patiently, and his determination regarding what he believed to be right, were both illustrated here. Despite the fact that his views concerning God's will were not accepted by his wife-to-be, he was willing to wait. That he waited for ten years shows the determination in his character. In his relationship with Jeffreys he was similarly determined. Here there is a similarity with Jeffreys, since Jeffreys was prepared to raise matters constantly if he felt that things needed to be changed. Both men were unwilling to accept situations if they felt that changes were needed. They were also unwilling to believe that they were wrong merely because situations seemed to point to that

⁴⁴⁷ She worked as one of the secretaries at Headquarters.

⁴⁴⁸ This was a very common device in seeking God's guidance at that time.

⁴⁴⁹ All this information was given by Mrs Phillips, Interview, op. cit.

conclusion. Although Phillips had been rebuffed by his wife-to-be, he was determined to experience what he believed was God's will for them. This determination was also witnessed in his relationship with Jeffreys. When Jeffreys was demanding change, Phillips took a determined stand against all the proposed developments. Jeffreys was a similar character. It has been seen that Jeffreys was willing to take positions that were contrary to those of colleagues and the general populace if he felt those positions to be true. However, for both men this determination could easily become a stubbornness that refused to come to terms with the situations around them.

The devotion that Phillips had for the Elim Movement was mirrored in Jeffreys' life. For many years Phillips had had no dependants to care for and so had been able to give his time unstintingly to Elim. Unfortunately, almost as soon as their married life began in 1936, he contracted tuberculosis and Mrs Phillips began her life with him nursing a much weakened man.⁴⁵⁰ One of their regrets was that because of his illness they were not able to have children.⁴⁵¹ Therefore, although married, Phillips was cared for and during that period managed to continue his involvement with the disagreements with Jeffreys. That neither had dependants is significant. Their legacy was the Movement that they had created and their calling in life was to protect their 'family'.⁴⁵² For Phillips this entailed resisting the changes that Jeffreys suggested; for Jeffreys,

⁴⁵⁰ Their first wedding anniversary was celebrated together in hospital.

⁴⁵¹ It was a common belief at the time that those with tuberculosis should not have children. Common advice was that, 'TB is not transmitted as a hereditary disease, but there is a greater tendency to develop the complaint in children born of infected parents or parent.' The Universal Home Doctor (London: Odhams Press, 1935), 684.

⁴⁵² The fact that this was an image that Jeffreys used constantly has already been remarked upon.

caring for the 'family' meant that it had to adapt to become obedient to God's intentions for the future.

That Phillips saw his own role as central to the development in Elim can be seen on the two occasions he felt that he had been accused of negligence in his administration of the Movement. He felt that these accusations were personal criticisms and so reacted vehemently. The first occasion was in 1926, when Boulton enquired about the state of the finances. Apparently, Phillips had told Boulton that the work was not as sound or satisfactory as it should have been, and suggested that if anyone examined the Alliance accounts there could be 'some awkward facts coming to light'. Phillips responded sharply to this charge, emphasising that he had not said anything to that effect, and would never be involved in the work if there were any financial irregularity.⁴⁵³

The second occasion occurred ten years later, when Jeffreys was attempting to raise finance to clear the debt. Phillips felt that Jeffreys' appeals in the Elim Evangel cast aspersions on his abilities to manage the financial matters.⁴⁵⁴

Jeffreys did not allay these fears, merely wanting to assure Phillips that all the Executive Council members had been negligent. He regretted Phillips seeing the article when he was so weak physically, but hoped that, 'a little later on when we hope his strength will have been renewed, he will see that it reflects upon all the old Executive'.⁴⁵⁵ Because Phillips did not believe there to be a financial crisis, let alone that he had been responsible for it, he was not willing

⁴⁵³ Letter, E.C.W. Boulton to Phillips, 30 December 1926.

⁴⁵⁴ See below for more details about the financial crisis.

⁴⁵⁵ Letter, Jeffreys to W.G. Hathaway, 28 April 1938.

to accept the blame at all. The issue became one of the factors provoking the breakdown in relations between the two men.

The final similarity between Phillips and Jeffreys lies in the fact that they both suffered serious illnesses. The illness that struck Phillips hastened the breakdown in the relationship between Jeffreys and Phillips. Phillips described his fear of what was happening to the Movement believing that they were 'on the edge of a precipice and any moment might come a catastrophe I could do nothing to prevent'.⁴⁵⁶ He had been informed by the doctor that his own illness had been caused partly by the strain of the work, but he maintained his workload, believing 'the state of the Elim work is a matter of greater importance to me than my own health'.⁴⁵⁷ This reflects the obsession that the arguments concerning the development of the Movement had become. No personal nor, in later days, national events could be allowed to deflect Phillips from his defence of the Movement from the actions of Jeffreys that he believed would be wholly detrimental. It was during the autumn of 1937, when Phillips was confined to bed, that many of the factors leading to the breakdown between the two men came to a head.⁴⁵⁸ The arguments regarding local church government policies had been developing for two or three years by that time, but the disagreements about British Israelism and the World Revival Crusade, in

⁴⁵⁶ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 7 September 1937.

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁵⁸ On 30 July 1937, he went to the Royal Northern Hospital where an X-ray revealed a small patch on his left lung. By the following week, 5 August 1937, he had been told that he would have to go and spend 6 to 9 months in a sanatorium. Boulton wrote, 'This is bad news and may mean much more than appears on the surface.' Letter E.C.W. Boulton to W.G. Hathaway, 3 August 1937 and 5 August 1937. It was not until 25 February that the Elim Evangel was able to report any improvement in his condition. (Hathaway, W.G., "Secretarial Notes", Elim Evangel 25 February 1938, 122.) He left the Isle of Wight on 18 March.

particular, had recently come out into the open. The Annual Conferences were beginning to be battle-grounds between the two men, which necessitated intricate preparation. Phillips briefed the Executive Council for the 1937 Conference from his bed. Although Jeffreys wrote to Phillips during this period, it does not seem that they met in person very often, which also meant that their relationship was inevitably strained.

At the beginning of 1938, Jeffreys also became incapacitated through illness. Edsor accounts for this illness as being the accumulated pressure of the financial situation. With Phillips incapacitated, Jeffreys had examined the Movement's accounts and begun a determined financial appeal to clear the debts. This appeal had been running for over a year before Jeffreys became ill. His illness, Cartwright refers to it simply as a breakdown,⁴⁵⁹ left him as a diabetic, a condition that persisted until his death. Phillips informed the Conference in 1939 that the instability that Jeffreys manifested was partly caused by this illness.⁴⁶⁰ What is clear is that the two leaders, who had been working in their respective fields under increasing strain, both found that their health let them down at the same time. They continued to react to each others' suggestions concerning the government of the Movement at a time when both were severely weakened. This left the Movement rudderless, and the relationship never survived this enforced separation.

⁴⁵⁹ Cartwright, 142.

⁴⁶⁰ Phillips, E.J. Appendix 1 'Any doctor will tell you that symptoms of his illness are just those revealed in his correspondence.'

Jeffreys believed that earlier the previous year, 1937, God had given him a divine order to 'Set your house in order'. He understood this to mean that the government of the churches had to change. There is no record of how he received this divine command. However, it may be significant that this command is framed in the same wording as the one that was given to Hezekiah (Isaiah 38:1). Hezekiah was persuaded to introduce reform into the kingdom because he believed he was descending to 'the gates of death'; at the 1938 Conference, Jeffreys used this phrase when referring to the illness' that he and Phillips had suffered.⁴⁶¹ This suggests that Jeffreys was aware of parallels between this Biblical situation and his own, and thus may have felt the urgency of reform because he thought his own death may have been imminent. They were both weakened men, each struggling to retain power from the other, each believing that they had a divine mandate to lead the Movement, despite being debilitated by their illnesses.

3.3 Phillips' view of Jeffreys

Throughout the period they worked together, the regard with which each held the other is evident from their correspondence. Even when their disagreements became most fundamental, Phillips pleaded with Jeffreys to listen to his advice. Phillips believed Jeffreys to be contumacious, Jeffreys believed Phillips to be reactionary. In 1939, letters began to be circulated amongst the ministers with charges and counter-charges. Phillips reminded Jeffreys that he had invited Jeffreys to his home and that they had agreed not to send the letters. He

⁴⁶¹ Conference Minutes 12 September 1938.

reflected on the hurt he had experienced when the advice he had tried to offer had always been regarded by Jeffreys as a personal rebuff. He closed his letter by saying, 'I would do anything to save both yourself and the work, but I am convinced that the solution is in your hands.'⁴⁶²

According to Phillips, the central issue that stood between Jeffreys and himself was that of British Israelism. In the following sections the arguments that he presented in public will be outlined. Generally, he felt that the doctrine, apart from being arrant nonsense, produced narrow-minded, divisive, arrogant fanatics who would cause trouble in churches. However, one further reason why he stood against the doctrine was because he was of Jewish ancestry himself, through his father's family. This was not a commonly known fact; his wife explained that he did not want others to know about this because he felt his arguments would be dismissed on that basis alone.⁴⁶³ This personal identification with Judaism must have convinced him of the fatuity surrounding the British Israel position, and, as the prelude to the Second World War was being sounded, one can only wonder at his own thoughts about the racial segregation and terror that was being inflicted upon European Jews.

In Phillips' mind, Jeffreys' obsession with this theory was also linked with his unwillingness to relinquish his power-base. Jeffreys always presented the problem as one of a need to offer freedom for people to hold a variety of

⁴⁶² Letter Phillips to Jeffreys, 9 August 1939.

⁴⁶³ M. Phillips, Interview, op. cit. cf M. Stormont, Interview, op. cit. who believed that he had not allowed this knowledge to become public so that people would not believe that he was rich.

positions. However, for Phillips it was more than that. He believed that Jeffreys would not, and perhaps could not, be content lest everyone held to his position wholeheartedly. In January 1939, they had what seems to have been a rare private meeting together, when Phillips outlined his fears about the situation. Jeffreys wrote a letter reflecting on the discussion. Because of the nature of the letter, and the light it sheds on the issues, it will be quoted at some length,

I am more than thankful to you for the long talk we had together on Friday at No. 10,⁴⁶⁴ for it has helped me to see myself through the eyes of others. I am not conscious of the failure you believe I am suffering from, viz. my unwillingness to give up my power, but I do say that if any of the Executive members or Ministers who believe the same thing, had been as faithful as you in telling me, the shadows of such a hindrance would have been removed long ago. If my memory serves me right, you are the first friend in twenty-five years to acquaint me of that failure. What a pity we as Ministers do not set the example to our people and conform more to the Scriptures in such matters! I honestly believed that you considered the B.I. question to be the real cause of the trouble between us. It was said that my Local Government scheme for some churches was introduced to bring in B.I.; my World Revival Crusade was formed to propagate B.I.; my proposal at the last Ministerial Conference was a back door through which I intended to bring B.I. into the Movement, and most unfair of all, my offer to give up Sole Trusteeship was a bribe to bring in B.I. through lay representation. For four years this has been going on and never once was I told what was believed to be the real trouble. I will never be able to thank you sufficiently for revealing to me what you considered to be the cause of the trouble, for you have given me an opportunity of dealing with the hindrance.⁴⁶⁵

The issue of power was a constant motif in the ongoing exchanges in the pamphlets published post-1940. Jeffreys accused Phillips and headquarters of operating a 'babylonish control';⁴⁶⁶ they, in return, implied that Jeffreys had

⁴⁶⁴ George Jeffreys home, 10 Clarence Avenue, Clapham

⁴⁶⁵ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 18 January 1939.

⁴⁶⁶ 'If the people had been given control over their own local affairs, the stupid, secret system of priestly and dictatorial government over pastors, people, property and finance of the Elim Churches would have been prevented. This stupid system made us at Headquarters do stupid things ... It seems as if Elim's unscriptural organisation has been, and still is, in the grip of the spirit of Babylon (confusion) and that those who are a party to it are urged to act against their own better judgement.' Jeffreys, G., "The Church or the Law - Which?" Pamphlet (1941) & article in Pattern November 1941, 2,3.

wanted to exercise a megalomaniac authority.⁴⁶⁷ On one of his trips to Ireland, post-1940, Phillips referred to this:

Is it not a fact that George Jeffreys found no fault with the Elim organisation when he was in control and had a majority on the Council, but when he failed to carry the Council and the Conference with him in his policy, then the fight began in an endeavour to regain control over the heads of the Council.⁴⁶⁸

The split was ostensibly about Jeffreys' desire to allow greater autonomy for the local churches but it was fuelled by the whole British Israel question and the formation of the World Revival Crusade in 1936 which was seen to be an alternative Movement. It was aggravated by the absence of Phillips from work through sickness when Jeffreys discovered the financial situation of the Movement, but ultimately it was about a lack of trust between the charismatic leader of an evangelistic Movement and the administrative and pastoral staff who were attempting to sustain a large number of new churches. The letters written between 1933 and 1940 present the ever-increasing chasm between Jeffreys and Phillips. It is clear that trust broke down completely between the two men.⁴⁶⁹

3.4 An uneasy reconciliation

The post-1940 events are those of people who have been deeply hurt by each other's actions. Greenway noted, 'how deeply he (Phillips) was hurt by the innuendoes which were directed against him during the time the work was

⁴⁶⁷ 'For a long time now the Council and the Conference have deplored the secrecy imposed upon the Elim work by the Principal, who insisted that all matters of the Alliance should be kept private. Immediately the Executive Council came into being they removed this rule from their books.' "Elim and Principal George Jeffreys" Pamphlet January 1941, 4.

⁴⁶⁸ Phillips, E.J. "Some Questions" Unpub. notes of speech. (n.d.)

⁴⁶⁹ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 14 January 1939.

threatened with complete disruption.⁴⁷⁰ However, in 1959 Phillips invited Jeffreys to celebrate with him his 40th anniversary in Elim. Jeffreys refused to go, saying that there was not much point exchanging pleasantries, unless Phillips was 'prepared to do right by the people'.⁴⁷¹ Consequently, he did not go. However, five weeks before Jeffreys died, Phillips and his wife did visit him. Some reconciliation was attempted by both parties. After Jeffreys died, Phillips wrote a tribute to him, referring to this meeting and the 'precious time of fellowship and prayer' they had shared together.⁴⁷²

Phillips died in his 79th year⁴⁷³ after having being incapacitated for a number of years following a cerebral haemorrhage. The tributes to him all referred to the amount of work he did for the Movement, and the devotion he showed to it. He had dominated the Movement for 54 years, for most of that time directly, but constantly indirectly, since the Movement's administration was wholly due to his work. Bradley was correct in designating him as 'the architect of Elim'.⁴⁷⁴ In many senses this can be witnessed to by the fact that by 1973 Elim had not essentially changed since 1940. However, within 7 years of his death the denomination would begin to be changed out of all recognition. For many people Phillips was directly dissimilar to Jeffreys. In fact, as we have suggested, their characters, and experiences, were similar to the extent that the clashes between them were inevitable. Ultimately, Phillips would prove

⁴⁷⁰ Greenway, H.G. "Well done ... faithful servant" Elim Evangel 22 September 1973, 3.

⁴⁷¹ Edsor, Interview, op. cit.

⁴⁷² Phillips, E.J. "Tribute to one of Britain's Greatest Evangelists", Elim Evangel 17 February 1962, 104

⁴⁷³ He died on 5 September 1973.

⁴⁷⁴ Bradley, J.T., "Editorial" Elim Evangel 15 September 1973, 2.

himself to be more able at winning over the confidence of the Elim ministers than Jeffreys, thus ensuring that it would be his influence, and not Jeffreys', that would have the dominating effect upon the denomination until his death. The split in Elim can be justifiably defined as a breakdown in relationship between these two men. These two men had been the originators of the denomination and yet in 1940 the climax of the fight for this denomination took place. Jeffreys, the charismatic leader and founder, had expected to win the arguments and influence the churches towards a greater flexibility. However, it was Phillips, the weakened administrator recovering from tuberculosis, who was the one able to maintain the leadership of the Movement. Behind the factual events of the split, and the interpretation of these events, lie the characters of the two men involved.

4. Conclusion

Although there are several explicit issues that will be examined in explaining the breakdown of the relationship between Jeffreys and Elim, Jeffreys' relationships are key to the implicit reasons for the split. He had encountered problems working with his brother, partly because of their similarities, but increasingly because their ministry areas were so closely allied. The problems in this relationship help to explain the reasons behind the deterioration of his relationship with Phillips. Apart from indicating that Jeffreys had previously experienced the dissolution of a relationship with someone that he had previously worked closely with, his relationship with Stephen is interesting because of Jeffreys' reaction to the dissolution. It is clear that Jeffreys viewed

the disintegration of the relationship in terms of a form of persecution, with himself as the martyr, torn by the spiritual demands of the general public that he had to meet and emotionally drained by Stephen's perceived treachery. The only solution was for Jeffreys not to meet Stephen. Indeed, no reconciliation was attempted until shortly before Stephen's death.

The role of the Revival Party in the disruption of Jeffreys' relationship with Phillips and Elim was also noted. They were a devoted band of followers, whose lives were wholly committed to Jeffreys and through him to the mission they had embraced. Their involvement with Jeffreys was so all-embracing that when one of the Party got married, the natural consequence was for him to disengage himself from the Revival Party. Their role was solely to support Jeffreys' ministry, and in doing so they inevitable protected him from the vicissitudes of opinion within Elim's ministerial circles. The esteem and whole-hearted devotion of the Revival Party blinded Jeffreys to the reality of his standing within Elim.

In all the events that developed throughout 1933 onwards, it was Jeffreys' relationship with Phillips that became the focus of the disagreements. Their personalities were remarkably similar: wholly dedicated to the Movement, determined and single-minded, unwilling to allow illness to render them marginalised from the activities within the Movement, fearful of the others' powers. Phillips, absolutely committed to the leadership of the Movement, protected the churches from the perceived danger of Jeffreys with fanatical

zeal. The next section will demonstrate the manoeuvrings that Phillips was involved in to fulfil his self-appointed role as protector of the Movement. When their relationship broke down irretrievably, Jeffreys reacted in the same way as he had done with his brother: no contact was made following the final break and no reconciliation was entertained until shortly before Jeffreys' death.

Part One: Summary and Conclusion

This first part of the thesis has examined the implicit reasons for the split and has suggested that the final discription of the Elim Pentecostal Church did not occur merely because of external theological and ecclesiastical reasons, but was the result of elements within the personality of its founder, George Jeffreys.

The section began by examining the impact of the Welsh Revival on Jeffreys. In particular, Jeffreys' definition and expectation of revival was detailed. Jeffreys believed that his own ministry paralleled earlier events in the Welsh Revival. This was in contrast to the churches who were constantly beseeching God to send revival and debating what revival would be like if God did send it. In arguing that he was witnessing revival through his own ministry, and therefore did not need to pray for it, he, albeit subconsciously, had distanced himself from the lives of many pastors. Jeffreys' success led him to believe that his ministry was unique within the denomination, consequently he needed to protect that ministry from potential accusations.

Whilst Jeffreys had benefited from the spontaneity of the groups that emerged from the Welsh Revival, from the earliest days of his leadership of Elim he was wary of spontaneity, particularly as evidenced in the ministry of other controversial evangelists such as Smith Wigglesworth. By taking this stand, and by being supported by the Elim leadership in this matter, his charismatic ministry remained unchallenged within Elim.

In a similar manner, Jeffreys was willing to hold divergent theological views from other ministers in Elim regarding the Holy Spirit. It needs to be noted that during this period of Pentecostal history, many were developing a pneumatology that would explicate their experience and do justice to their exegesis of scripture. Therefore, Jeffreys was not unusual in holding to divergent views. However, it is significant that the ministers in Elim were increasingly unhappy with his views and began to develop alternative views. In the arguments that follow, it will be seen that Jeffreys often held to minority positions. This did not worry him since he had been in that position in discussions concerning so many different issues in the past.

Jeffreys' evangelistic success was examined, since his success in this area was deemed to be a vindication of his future plans for the future of the Movement. Whilst not wishing to deny that God used him to lead many to profess conversion, it seems not too reductionist to suggest that Jeffreys was operating in such a changing social era that people were predisposed to the entertaining style of his ministry. He provided a religious and moral alternative to secular society and was able to adapt the modernising processes occurring within society to the cause of evangelisation.

The final section examined his relationships, in particular his relationship with Phillips. The fact that Jeffreys eventually felt it necessary to resign from Elim was due to the determined actions of Phillips. Had Phillips and Jeffreys not shared such similar personalities, the culmination of their relationship would

have been very different. Since they were both so single-minded and determined, the arguments concerning the specific issues were destined to lead to a final fissure. It is these specific issues which will be examined next.

Part Two: Explicit Reasons for the Schism

Alongside the implicit reasons for the split between Jeffreys and Elim, there were a number of explicit causes. These include the Irish situation, the British Israel controversy, the formation of the World Revival Crusade, the financial state of the Movement and the fundamental disagreement about church government. Each of these issues will be examined at length and the development of the arguments will be observed. Taken together with the implicit causes for the split, these explicit issues supply a full account of the split between the charismatic leader and the denomination he founded.

1 The Irish Situation

Although the Elim Church began its life in Ireland, the discontent amongst the Irish churches was a source of increasing discomfort for Jeffreys and the Movement as a whole and one of the contributory factors in the eventual split in 1940. Of all the issues that have been examined in other studies, the Irish situation has been overlooked. This has been a major oversight since the situation in the Irish churches presaged the whole local government controversy.

1. The Irish Socio-Political Background

The initial endeavours of the Elim Evangelistic Band took place during one of the most turbulent periods of Irish history. By the close of 1912, the Ulster Volunteer Force had been instituted. This was followed by the formation of the Irish Volunteers, which by January 1914 numbered 10,000 men; five months later, the group had mushroomed to 129,000 men.⁴⁷⁵ The outbreak of World War One brought the political wrangling over the Home Rule Bill to a temporary halt and provided a pause in the sectarian aggression. However, on 24-28 April 1916, 450 people were killed in the Easter Rising in Dublin. By autumn 1916, the six counties in the north had been promised exclusion from the proposed Dublin government.

After the cessation of World War One, violence resumed and in 1919, Belfast witnessed the killing of 109 people.⁴⁷⁶ Over the period July 1920 to July 1922, a

⁴⁷⁵ Bardon, J. A History of Ulster, (Belfast: The Black Staff Press, 1992) 447.

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid., 485.

total of 557 people were killed in Ulster. In the city of Belfast, 236 people were killed in the first few months of 1922.⁴⁷⁷ For Catholics in particular, the sectarian struggle was very costly. Catholic Relief organisations estimated that between 8,700 to 11,000 Catholics had lost their jobs, 23,000 Catholics had been forced out of their homes and 500 Catholic businesses had been destroyed.⁴⁷⁸

With evangelism being undertaken against this background, one might have expected some comment to have been passed on the situation, or references alluding to it, in articles or printed sermons, but this is almost completely absent from Elim publications. The only direct reference to the 'Troubles' was made retrospectively in 1936. Phillips, reviewing the events of 1921, recounted that machine guns had been posted outside the church in Melbourne Street, Belfast, and told how the church members had been frequently searched by the military authorities.⁴⁷⁹ However, in all the articles recollecting the birth of Elim, the emphasis concerns evangelism and the significance of the birth of the new denomination, rather than the social and political background within which they were operating.⁴⁸⁰ The only references that do exist in print are in the reports written by Thomas Hackett, for Confidence. Reporting in 1918 on the conventions being held in Ulster, the political problems were mentioned to emphasise that 'the only cure for Ireland's woes is the Gospel of Christ'.⁴⁸¹

⁴⁷⁷ Ibid., 494.

⁴⁷⁸ Ibid., 494.

⁴⁷⁹ Phillips, E.J. unpub. ms for Crystal Palace Coming of Age Celebration, 1936.

⁴⁸⁰ For example, in the history of the period 1913-1928 described in Boulton (1928) there are no references at all to the Irish political situation nor to the Great War.

⁴⁸¹ Hackett, T.E. "A remedy for Ireland's Troubles" Confidence July-September, 1918, 55. In the previous issue, he made the same comment. He referred to the encouraging results of the meetings in Ulster, which were 'such a source of anxiety at the present

2. The Birth and Growth of the Elim Churches

A delegate from Belfast was so impressed by Jeffreys' preaching at the Sunderland Convention in May 1913 that he returned home determined to invite the evangelist to Ulster. On his return, William Gillespie consulted his brother, George, and they sent Jeffreys thirty shillings for his fare. Jeffreys stayed in their home, and held a few meetings there.⁴⁸² Although a proposed mission in Monaghan was cancelled when permission to use the Methodist hall was withdrawn after the trustees realised that the evangelist was a Pentecostal, Jeffreys managed to hold a few meetings there.⁴⁸³ He also preached at a convention in Belfast, followed by meetings in Bangor, Co. Down during July and August. He then returned to England, holding a successful series of meetings in Plymouth and Coulsdon. When Jeffreys returned to Ireland in 1914, he linked up with the small groups of Pentecostal believers in Belfast and Bangor.⁴⁸⁴

While preaching at the 1914 Christmas Convention in Dover Street, Belfast he was invited to revisit Monaghan by Frederick Farlow, Robert Mercer, Albert Kerr, George Allen, John H. Mercer, and William Henderson.⁴⁸⁵ These young

time. Here, and here only, is the potent remedy for all her (Ireland's) woes.'

"Pentecostal Meetings in Belfast" Confidence April-June 1918, 21.

⁴⁸² Smith (J. "A Loving Tribute to Mr George Gillespie" Elim Evangel, 2 June 1947, 307) reported, 'He together with his brother William, have been referred to as "The sponsors of the new child called Elim."' Their home was in Pine Street, Belfast.

⁴⁸³ There seems to be disagreement between the accounts presented by Boulton and Cartwright. Cartwright (39) dismisses this first attempt at evangelism in Monaghan as a non-event, 'The mission there had to be aborted even though the leaflets had been printed'. Boulton (22), however, recording Jeffreys' letter from Monaghan, presents it as much more of a success. 'From the first of the meetings God has been saving souls, and sinners have been trembling under conviction of sin ... The young men who organised this campaign are on fire for God, and have received quite recently the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, which first fell at Sunderland some seven years ago.'

⁴⁸⁴ Cartwright, 43.

⁴⁸⁵ In a letter to Derek Green, then head of the Publications Board, W. Robert Mercer, son

men invited Jeffreys to go and discuss with them 'how to reach their country with the full Gospel for Spirit, Soul, and Body, and to spread the news of the Pentecostal outpouring'.⁴⁸⁶ The Minute Book of the Elim Evangelistic Band recorded their first meeting in Knox's Temperance Hotel on 7 January 1915.

They proposed that,

George Jeffreys, of South Wales, who was present with us, be invited to take up a permanent evangelistic work in Ireland and that a centre be chosen for him for the purpose of establishing a church out of which evangelists would be sent into towns and villages, and that a tent be hired, for the purpose of holding a Gospel Mission during the month of July to commence the work in Ireland.⁴⁸⁷

They also decided at this meeting that every worker would be financed on 'faith lines'.⁴⁸⁸

By the time the Band met in June,⁴⁸⁹ a suggestion about a building was presented. This building was in Hunter Street, Belfast which opened as the first Elim⁴⁹⁰ church in October that year, with Jeffreys as the resident pastor.⁴⁹¹

of John Mercer, wrote to give a few more details regarding these men. William Henderson was the oldest of the group and entered Elim as a minister. His book on church government (Church Ministry and Organisation London: Victory Press, 1931) became a textbook used at the Elim Bible College. George Allen married Mrs Sargent, Jeffreys' housekeeper when he lived at Highbury Gardens, Belfast. Frederick Farlow was one of the first to join the Elim Evangelistic Band. John Mercer, a local businessman, left Monaghan and lived in Lurgan and then Portadown. He was an elder of the latter church for over 50 years. No information was given concerning Albert Kerr nor Robert Mercer. However, Robert Mercer also joined the Evangelistic Band, becoming a loyal supporter of Jeffreys. Letter W.R. Mercer to D. Green, 6 January 1986.

⁴⁸⁶ Jeffreys, G. "A Prophetic Vision fulfilled or How the Elim work in Ireland began" Elim Evangel December 1921, 6.

⁴⁸⁷ Cartwright, 43.

⁴⁸⁸ Boulton, 27.

⁴⁸⁹ June 1915; so Boulton, 28, cf. Cartwright, 44, who does not mention this meeting but asserts that July 1915 was the second one. It is probable that Boulton refers to a meeting at which minutes were not recorded. The meeting in July was entered into the Minute Book as the "Second Informal Meeting of Pentecostal Workers at Monaghan". Edsors, (1964) 24.

⁴⁹⁰ The name Elim was chosen for two reasons. It was named after the Elim Mission, Lytham, where George had preached during his time at the Preston Bible School, and referred to the oasis that the children of Israel came upon in the wilderness. Cartwright, 45-46.

⁴⁹¹ That Jeffreys could point to holding a pastoral charge resulted in him avoiding

The hall, a disused laundry, was a dilapidated building in a very rough area of the city.⁴⁹² At the following Band meeting of July 1915, they were informed that two workers had agreed to join the Evangelistic band. Robert Ernest Darragh and Margaret Montgomery Streight became the first two full-time workers in Elim.⁴⁹³ In February 1916, Jeffreys opened up a Pentecostal work in Ballymena. He established the work with a campaign held at Easter over a period of five weeks. During this period 120 people professed salvation and 23 were baptised.⁴⁹⁴ By Christmas that year, they had gained enough of a following to host a Christmas series of meetings when over 700 people met in the Town Hall.

In Belfast, the church continued to grow and gain confidence, and in May 1916, Confidence included a report on the Easter Convention held in the city attended by Leech. He had left Dublin on Saturday 22 April, just before the Easter Rising began.⁴⁹⁵ The Convention began in the Kinghan Hall, Botanic Avenue and was continued in Hunter Street. The speakers included an unidentified leader from Holland, T.E. Hackett and George Jeffreys.⁴⁹⁶ In 1917,

conscription. T. Hackett, Confidence April-June 1918, 20.

⁴⁹² In an article by Darragh (R.E., "Elim Mission Convention", Confidence May 1916, 81) Mrs Leech wrote, 'The Elim Hall is situated in a very poor populous district, truly a light in a dark place'. According to Proctor (H. "Elim", Elim Evangel, 15 December 1925, 288) the building was a 'miserable-looking, tumble-down building, on which the boys had chalked in large letters: "The Haunted Church". To this poor hovel came the Pastor with Mr. Darragh, and Miss Adams'. Farlow (F. From unpub. ms for Crystal Palace Coming of Age Celebration, 1936, repeated in Cartwright, 45) wrote, 'There is not a whole pane of glass in any of the windows. To put new glass in those windows would cost so much, so we decided to fill the openings with some old rags'.

⁴⁹³ Boulton, 29. Cartwright (44) makes the interesting point that Streight had previously been rejected by the Pentecostal Missionary Union for being 'too fanatical'.

⁴⁹⁴ Hackett, T. E., "A Remedy for Ireland's Troubles" Confidence July-September 1918, 54 and Jeffreys, G. Letter Confidence, August 1916, 130. 'We have up to the present witnessed one hundred and twenty conversions, and still they come in. Hallelujah!'

⁴⁹⁵ "Elim Mission Convention" Confidence May 1916, 81.

⁴⁹⁶ The Belfast News Letter, 1 May 1916, as reported in Confidence May 1916, op. cit., 82.

tent campaigns were held in Great Ormeau Park where four hundred people gathered each night to hear Jeffreys speak. During this time, he was joined by his brother Stephen, and Pastor Moelfryn Morgan from Ammanford, Wales.⁴⁹⁷ Hackett, reporting the meetings, told how Morgan, who had never previously preached in English, experienced the use of xenolalia. This is noteworthy since whilst it was common in other Pentecostal groups, it was rarely recorded in Elim circles. Apparently, Morgan had gone to the meetings armed with sermon manuscripts written in perfect English so that he would not be misunderstood. However, after eight minutes the manuscript had to be discarded as under 'the power of the mighty Spirit' he found himself 'upborne and carried forward with astonishing ease and liberty, till it was manifest by the waning power of the Sprit and increasing difficulty of the English, it was time for the address to close.'⁴⁹⁸

In time, due to its limited size, the building at Hunter Street, Belfast became unsuitable and the church needed to find larger premises. The ceremony for the new building, on Melbourne Street, Belfast, known as the Belfast Tabernacle, was held on Saturday, 5 July 1919.⁴⁹⁹

3. The Irish churches post-1920

Although this period of work in Ireland was marked by periods of great encouragement, by 1920 much of Jeffreys' time and energy was focused on

⁴⁹⁷ Morgan had signed George's ordination certificate earlier at a meeting in Bangor on 18 July 1917.

⁴⁹⁸ Hackett, T.E. "Pentecostal Meeting in Belfast." Confidence, April-June 1918, 20.

⁴⁹⁹ Hare, E.W. "Pentecostal Tabernacle at Belfast". Confidence, October-December 1919, 59.

establishing Elim churches in England. In 1920, Elim consisted of 15 churches and 21 workers; all these churches were situated in Ireland. By 1928, there were 70 churches and 53 workers; of these, 39 churches were in England, 8 were in Wales, 5 in Scotland and 1 in the Channel Islands. Ireland still only consisted of 17 churches.⁵⁰⁰

The problems in the Irish churches came about partly due to a sense of being overlooked, as evidenced by the above figures, but also due to disagreements concerning church government. In 1924, Elim moved its Headquarters from Belfast to London. In 1928, Boulton, in a clear attempt to placate the Irish, praised the 'sacrifice' of the Ulster Pentecostals of not being the recipients of Jeffreys' full attention,

For several years now Pastor George Jeffreys' growing number of large campaigns, which take him all over the British Isles, have necessitated his absence from Ireland for long periods together. In fact some time ago it was found imperative, owing to the growth of the work, to transfer the headquarters from Belfast to London. It goes without saying that the dear Irish saints felt the priority of the claim upon the Founder. However, realising it was part of the price of progress that they were called upon to pay, they gladly suffered the sacrifice, knowing full well that their loss would mean gain to the Alliance work in general.⁵⁰¹

However, by 1933, Phillips acknowledged that the Irish churches had good cause to feel neglected by Jeffreys:

The people think they are neglected while we are pushing ahead in all other parts of the British Isles. Of course this is true - there has been practically no advance in Ireland for ten years or more.⁵⁰²

⁵⁰⁰ By 1937, when there were 179 churches in England, 14 in Wales, 10 in Scotland and 3 in the Channel Islands, there were only 27 in Ireland. All these figures were collated by Cartwright.

⁵⁰¹ Boulton, 48.

⁵⁰² Letter Phillips to Jeffreys, 17 October 1933.

Although Jeffreys had been to Ireland on specific occasions to preach, particularly at the Easter and Christmas Conventions,⁵⁰³ in 1931 he returned to Ireland to hold evangelistic campaigns there at the wish of Phillips, much against his own inclinations. These were the first such meetings he had held there since the Headquarters office had moved to England. He was amazed at the fruitfulness of the meetings.⁵⁰⁴ Nevertheless, on his return in 1933, he believed the churches to be in a worse state than when he had first visited. Jeffreys' intention in re-visiting Ireland had been to encourage the churches and to ensure that the Elim work was developing satisfactorily, but on his arrival his impression of the churches was unremittingly pessimistic. He believed that the work was in danger of collapsing, with nothing being left of any real value. His letters to Phillips made clear that he believed the only solution would be the introduction of a policy of local church government.⁵⁰⁵

Phillips' replies concerning the Irish situation were far more optimistic. He believed that Jeffreys was simply exaggerating the difficulties there, and that the best remedy was to deal with individual situations as they were discovered, to stay with the existing local church government framework and to ride out the storms of controversy.⁵⁰⁶ Jeffreys pointed out that all the people that had been

⁵⁰³ Boulton, 127-133.

⁵⁰⁴ Pastor W.R. Mercer, nephew of Robert Mercer, recalled this visit to Portadown. 'How well I remember that great campaign in Portadown, N. Ireland (1931).... The years can never dim the memory of the last great service when the streets were filled with a great crowd of people standing around the car in which the Revival Party was leaving, singing as only an Irish audience can the 23rd Psalm.' Edsall, (1964) 73.

⁵⁰⁵ Letter Jeffreys to Phillips, 15 October 1933, 'The Irish work evidently is in a very degenerate condition and needs attention or we shall soon be a back number in this country. You have no idea what I have to contend with at present.'

⁵⁰⁶ Letter Phillips to Jeffreys, 17 October 1933, 'To experiment with Local Church Government in Northern Ireland, especially in a place like Portadown, will be to spread dissatisfaction, and may mean the disintegration of the work in Ulster.' Cf. 25 October 1933, 'I am sorry to note your remarks about the condition of the work in Ireland. I do

won for Elim had deserted the churches and understood the reason for this to be the organisational problems that Elim had in Ireland. Rules that had been agreed in England were not being adhered to. For example, he could find no treasurers or secretaries who actually dealt with finance; almost universally, it was handled by the pastor alone. The result of pastors electing church officers was that these local leaders had become 'monuments ... strutting about in the churches, a stumbling block and a positive hindrance to any progress in the church'⁵⁰⁷ since they did not feel accountable to the church members. People were not loyal to the churches because they had been given no possibility of involvement beyond merely listening to sermons. There was evidence of discontent with the churches' relationship with Headquarters. People had been praying publicly, asking 'God to smash the secret society at Headquarters and to save the work from Popery'.⁵⁰⁸ The development of Jeffreys' concern for the need for changes in church government stem from this period. This situation reveals a number of issues that would become increasingly significant in the years to come. Decisions had been made by the Headquarters officers without sufficient regard of the effects of those decisions. Having created a Movement that was dependant upon Jeffreys for the establishment of new churches, it was inevitable that when he left the province the churches would feel bereft and in time that feeling of loss would turn to bitterness. When the Irish churches were complaining of the lack of attention from Jeffreys, it is interesting that the solution was for Jeffreys to visit them once again, not for the Irish churches to

not agree with you as to the cause of its present state, nor consequently as to the best method for its cure.'

⁵⁰⁷ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 23 October 1933.

⁵⁰⁸ Ibid.

begin establishing churches themselves. From the earliest days the Elim Movement was dependant upon one man's ministry.

Secondly, Jeffreys' melodramatic portrayal of the situation fed his belief that a drastic change in policy was needed if the problems were to be averted. In the intensification of the arguments in the future, Jeffreys regularly emphasised the difficulties so as to encourage acceptance of his solutions. Phillips, typically, always reacted to Jeffreys' pessimism by encouraging him to retain a wider perspective and not make precipitous decisions. The third significant feature of this argument concerns the use of the laity to vindicate possible policy decisions. If Jeffreys was accurately reporting the response of the church members to Headquarters, then it reveals the danger that was involved in the brinkmanship of Philips and Jeffreys in the late 1930s as they sought to claim the support of the laity for their respective positions.

4. The opportunity provided by the Portadown Elim Church

The church at Portadown provided Jeffreys with the incentive to introduce his ideas regarding local church autonomy. Originally, all the Elim churches were under the sole control of the ministers, with little input from local leaders. All financial arrangements had been dealt with through Headquarters, ministers being paid from a central financial pool. This resulted in the ministers feeling that their priority was their loyalty to the denomination rather than to the local church. However, in Ireland particularly, this had led to tension between the ministers and the local people. Many of the early Irish Pentecostal laity had

come from Presbyterian or Brethren backgrounds; their expectation of ministers was that they would function as part of a team of elders, albeit *primus inter pares*. Because of the tension between clergy and laity in Portadown, Jeffreys believed the church to be in danger of being 'beyond redemption'.

Consequently, he saw the Portadown Elim Church as a place that could be used as 'a real test case' where a modified scheme of local government could be introduced.⁵⁰⁹ There was a need for a new building in Portadown and Jeffreys saw that the possibility of buying a new building would be the obvious time to introduce this new local government.

He suggested that the present pastor should remain for another year, with any private gifts that he may receive during that period being given towards the outstanding debt. The local secretary and treasurer would pay the pastor and apply any of the surplus funds to the debt. The church would be given the local church financial account and after a year, the church would vote into place local church officials, and, if he were willing to stay, retain the pastor. Since Jeffreys would be raising the finance for the new building, he would have trustees appointed to hold the church under the Alliance. However, his suggestions regarding church government were inconsistent. He wanted local people to have a measure of self-determination, whilst also ensuring that he and Phillips would remain trustees, saying, 'I would rather be a trustee with you than to have any local men seeing it is to be made a test case'.⁵¹⁰ Jeffreys was

⁵⁰⁹ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 15 October 1933.

⁵¹⁰ Ibid.

prepared to go ahead and instruct a solicitor to begin the work with immediate effect.

Phillips, however, was much more cautious in his response to the situation.

Recognising that there were problems in Ulster, he felt that to start introducing changes into some of the churches, but not into all, would cause discontent.

His suggestion was that the church could allow local trustees to take responsibility for the finances whilst still being under the direct government of Headquarters. For Jeffreys, this caution was inappropriate since he felt that so many problems were beginning to surface. Jeffreys wanted to introduce quick, decisive action:

Disintegration is already a foregone conclusion in Ireland unless we do something and that quickly. There is scarcely a church or worker that is not going ahead in fear and trembling, hoping against hope that salvation will come from somewhere.⁵¹¹

He sent Phillips a proposed set of minutes⁵¹² of the meeting that would be held on 23 October 1933. The minutes indicate that he wanted the local church to be able to acquire a new building quickly. The trustees would be appointed by Jeffreys, and consequently the building would be owned by the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance. The overseers of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance and the leaders of the local church would be held to this arrangement until the debt was paid off. The only way the situation could be changed would be by the Alliance paying off the debt. There was a set of rules regarding membership; the members' responsibilities would include deciding the salary of the Pastor and whether he should be retained for a second year. Membership

⁵¹¹ Ibid.

⁵¹² Whilst he called them minutes, they clearly were not minutes in the conventional sense. They were actually the agenda that he was to present to the churches.

was to be open to all who had 'a definite testimony to the New Birth'. If a member subscribed a minimum tithe of one shilling per week, they would be eligible to participate in the voting of church officers.⁵¹³

Phillips' reply stressed his incredulity at Jeffreys' plan. To Phillips, the root cause of the situation in Ireland stemmed from the fact that the work there had been neglected and had been left with a District Superintendent overseeing the work from London,⁵¹⁴ and so had suffered from a lack of an overall strategy. He pointed out that if Jeffreys believed that these plans would further the work, then he stood alone. The Executive Council and the Conference had both made it clear that no other minister agreed to this form of local church government. All of them wished to retain ministerial control over the churches. He wrote to Jeffreys forcefully,

I don't know whether you think we are all blind, but candidly, I cannot see why you want to disregard the opinion of every Overseer and every D. S. and 98% or 99% of our Ministers.⁵¹⁵

Regarding the detailed minutes Phillips was dismissive, 'It is not worth my while going into the details of the proposed Minutes which I return herewith, as I don't approve of any of it.'⁵¹⁶ In an attempt to placate Jeffreys, Phillips suggested that the situation was not as desperate as Jeffreys feared. He told Jeffreys that he had held a separate meeting with the Irish workers, and whilst there were

⁵¹³ Minutes of meeting to be held on 23 October 1933, issued before the event to Phillips, Letter 18 October 1933.

⁵¹⁴ The unexpected death of William Henderson on 30 June 1931 was a great loss to Elim generally, and to Jeffreys in particular. The Irish work suffered from his loss. Strachan (J.S., "I remember" Elim Evangel 20 November 1965, 757) recalled, 'When Mr Henderson was suddenly called to higher service it seemed as if a pillar had collapsed and left the building so much weaker'. Joseph Smith took over as the District Superintendent of Ireland whilst resident in London from August 1931 to April 1933.

⁵¹⁵ Letter Phillips to Jeffreys, 20 October 1933,

⁵¹⁶ Ibid.

problems, he did not believe that they were as acute as Jeffreys had suggested. This was to be a source of constant contention between the two men. Jeffreys believed that he understood the feelings of the workers and the people in the churches since he was the one in touch with them. He believed this contrasted with Phillips who was limited to an administrative knowledge. On this occasion, Phillips left the final decision with Jeffreys but made it clear that he wanted to distance himself completely from any decisions that would be taken which would result in local church government.

I must leave the entire thing to you as I look upon this whole proposal as a fatal mistake. If you want to go ahead with it, there is nothing to hinder you. I would certainly not agree to become a co-trustee with you, nor would I have anything to do with the arrangements at Portadown either now or after they are carried out.⁵¹⁷

He suggested that if there was any possibility of introducing a policy of local church government, it would be better to introduce it elsewhere, possibly among the churches who were wanting to join Elim, rather than to change the status of an existing Elim church operating under guidelines relating to the Direct Government of churches.

Phillips' refusal to be involved in changing the situation in Ireland forced Jeffreys to withdraw his plans regarding Portadown until he felt that Phillips would be willing to agree to changes. Jeffreys wrote a long summary of his feelings about Ireland. His words were strong, and expressed his frustration with the Irish churches. Characteristically, he then returned to the themes he had agreed to drop. He was due to meet with leaders in Ireland and believed

⁵¹⁷

Ibid.

that his ideas concerning a measure of self determination for the churches had would make a difference.

Phillips replied and again laid out his opposition to the plans, arguing that the reason for the unrest was due to the introduction of local leaders in the place of ministerial control; previously ministers had had sole control of the assemblies. The ministers who had been appointed had not been sufficiently capable, and some of the ministers had created problems in the churches they had overseen. He suggested that a modification of the existing rules would be sufficient to reduce the unrest in the Irish churches. Not moving the minister without his approval, allowing the church treasurers and secretaries to remain in office for a maximum of three years, allowing the local church to have a local bank account, and allowing any surplus funds to go towards the building account would all mean that some of the tensions would be reduced.⁵¹⁸

Jeffreys' reply gave an account of the meeting with the Irish workers, and indicated that after discussion they had come to the same conclusions as he had previously proposed. He directly answered Phillips' four points. If Headquarters appointed a minister but did not allow the church to express their views, the problems would perpetuate; if three more years were to be allowed to the secretaries and treasurers, 'stick in the muds' as he termed them, 'there will be very little left of the assembly except the stick in the muds'; there was no point in churches having bank accounts unless all the cash was handled by the

⁵¹⁸ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 25 October 1933.

local church officers; he approved of the local church using surplus offerings towards their own building funds. He grudgingly accepted that they would need to meet to discuss the situation, since he had come to the end of his visit to Ireland.⁵¹⁹

This period of intense correspondence during October 1933 was typical of much of the working relationship between Jeffreys and Phillips. Jeffreys, feeling that he was more able to understand the peoples' feelings, had a negative view of the work. Phillips, distanced from the situation, took a more leisurely approach to the problems believing that an adaptation of the existing rules would be the preferable option. Phillips also was clear in his understanding that this was not a problem merely between Jeffreys and himself, but was between Jeffreys and the Overseers and the vast majority of the ministers. Phillips, in seeking to limit Jeffreys' plans, was eager to demonstrate how isolated Jeffreys was. However, as Jeffreys had been willing to stand for minority viewpoints before, he was prepared to do so again, demonstrating his unwillingness to retreat from his position, even after agreeing to do so. This tenacity was to be demonstrated on many occasions over the next seven years. There was a possibility that he could have caused a split in 1933 and taken the Irish churches with him, appealing to their difficulties while castigating the Headquarters staff.

⁵¹⁹ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 26 October 1933.

5. 1935: The return to the familiar themes

Whilst the incident in 1933 was soon overshadowed by events surrounding the handing over of executive power from Jeffreys to an Executive Council by the signing of the Deed Poll, the features of the subsequent disagreement were in place. The scenario for the final confrontation was being prepared, but on this occasion any final disruption was averted. However, the situation in Ireland did not improve and continued to feed Jeffreys' drive for local church government. In 1935, as part of the ongoing debate concerning church government, Irish congregations were given the chance to vote on the situation in their own country. Jeffreys was clear in his aims. He wanted to ascertain what the demands of the Irish people were by issuing a questionnaire; he then proposed to give them all they desired, leading them as best he could. He felt that this would be the only workable solution, which, while not answering all the problems, would mean that the English could ask the Irish to resolve their own situation.⁵²⁰ Phillips, on behalf of the Headquarters' staff, agreed that changes were necessary, but was concerned that suggestions were being made that ultimately were not desired by Headquarters.⁵²¹ Therefore, the final questionnaire was radically different from the original one suggested by Jeffreys. Jeffreys had wanted to include questions asking whether congregations should vote for pastors and elders, whether an Irish Superintendent was necessary, and what qualifications should be imposed on those who did vote in church meetings. The questions that were asked and the results are as below:

⁵²⁰ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 1 November 1935.

⁵²¹ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 19 November 1935.

The questionnaire was returned by 746 people.

1. Are you quite satisfied with the existing government, and working arrangements in the Elim churches in Ireland? Please state "Yes" or "No".

Votes: Yes: 261; No: 353

2. If you are not quite satisfied, please state below any changes you consider should be made in the working arrangements.
3. If any further voting on matters concerning the work should become necessary,

do you consider that all church members should have a vote,

or only those who subscribe a regular sum to the church funds?

Votes: All church members: 431;

Those who subscribe a regular sum: 106.

4. If you favour voting by only those who subscribe a regular sum, should

that sum be 1/-, 6d., or 3d.?

Vote: 1/- : 46

6d.: 6

3d.: 20

5. It is proposed to hold at Belfast on Boxing Day this year a meeting of representatives of the Irish Churches to discuss the work in Ireland.

You are asked to choose two brethren who are members of your Church to act as delegates to that meeting. Please write below the names of those you choose.⁵²²

As a result of the meeting on 26 December 1935, the rules for secretaries and treasurers were modified to reflect the wishes of the people.⁵²³ The Irish churches would have the same government structures as those in the British Isles, except that they would have elders, appointed by the church members, who would appoint all local Church officers. There would be an annual meeting of the Irish Presbytery, consisting of the elders and the pastors who would report any decisions to the Executive Council, although the Council would not be bound by any of the decisions made. The Superintendent would be

⁵²² Questionnaire sent to Irish churches, undated, but definitely sent within a few days after 20 November 1935, which was the final letter from Jeffreys to Phillips on the matter.

⁵²³ Modifications in Rules for Secretaries and Treasurers (Direct Government under the Council) for Ireland. (London: Elim Publishing Co., February 1936).

appointed by the Executive Council, but would work from an office in Belfast. Financially, local churches would be responsible for ministry costs and the maintenance of buildings. A tithe would be paid to the Irish headquarters, of which a subsequent tithe would be paid to London. Any surplus funds would be retained for the work in Ireland. Because the final questionnaire used had been a compromise for both Jeffreys and Phillips, who had not wanted a questionnaire at all, the final results fully satisfied neither party. Jeffreys could point to the fact that a majority of Elim people in Ireland were not happy with the existing working arrangements, but he was not able to provide the wholesale changes that he had previously desired. Similarly, Phillips had been able to modify the rules, within a wider framework that included the English churches, but was aware that these changes would be insufficient ultimately.

Almost as soon as the new rules had been agreed upon, Jeffreys was prepared to change them. When a problem occurred in the Ulster Temple church, Ravenhill Road, Belfast, his suggestion was to introduce new rules to meet the situation. This pragmatism, willing to work outside any existing framework, was opposed by Phillips, who felt sure that the correct course was for Jeffreys to visit the church and placate the leadership. His final comment on the situation is very revealing:

As we here at headquarters are absolutely fed up with things in Ireland, we would be prepared to accept any reasonable proposal.⁵²⁴

By this stage, the contentious issues in Elim were beginning to gather momentum. The problems in Ireland, therefore, should be seen against the

⁵²⁴ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 4 November 1936.

background of Jeffreys' wider discontent, and Phillips' attempt to keep Elim functioning without introducing any of the wide-scale reforms that were being suggested.

As with all the contributing factors to the split, the climax came in 1939 at the Ministerial Conference. A proposal was laid before the Conference by F.

Carson, G. Bell and G. Gillespie supported by about 20 Irish ministers. It read,

We do not recognise or authorise London Headquarters or the Ministerial Conference to vote or pass resolutions affecting the Irish Work.⁵²⁵

A general debate ensued during which grievances were expressed concerning the holding of harvest festivals in churches, the use of clerical collars by ministers and the use of the title 'Reverend'. Strong objections were raised against some Elim representatives who did not believe that the gift of tongues was the initial sign of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Although these items may seem to be trivial, to those involved in the debate they were viewed as Irish "shibboleths" that needed to be confronted. The strength of the Irish churches was tested in these discussions rather than in the more direct confrontation regarding the confidence the Province had in the English Headquarters' staff. Responding to the concerns expressed and the feelings behind them, Phillips attempted to encapsulate the reasons for the troubles being experienced in Ireland. He pointed out that,

1. In the beginning the Irish churches had elders ordained by Jeffreys. These were later displaced by local church officers leading to division and resentment.
2. In 1929, collections at all meetings were enforced against the will of the people.

⁵²⁵

Taken from unpub. hand-written notes of Robert Tweed. He also noted the points made by Phillips.

3. The Irish Superintendent had lived in London and in 1934 District Superintendents were withdrawn after having been there a year or so, leaving no-one to oversee the work in Ireland at a time when there were many young men and probationers in charge of churches.
4. There had been no campaigns held regularly in Ireland.
5. There had been serious trouble in at least two of the Irish churches.
6. The rules about voting only being open to those who paid a shilling subscription had been destructive in the churches.
7. At Christmas 1935, Jeffreys had insisted that elders should be voted into position. In 1936, the elders demanded that their positions should be permanent. In 1937, the property question was raised and dealt with satisfactorily. However, in 1938, Jeffreys refused to sign the property over.⁵²⁶

Jeffreys did not return to Ireland until after the war.

6. Conclusion

Ireland had played its part in the division between Jeffreys and Phillips. Long before Jeffreys argued for local government in English churches, he had wanted to experiment with it in Ireland. This desire to experiment with local church government resulted from a pessimism that believed the Irish Elim churches to be in such a poor state that whatever measures were introduced, the situation could only improve. In the debates between Phillips and Jeffreys, themes emerged which would become repetitive in the debates over other matters: Jeffreys' assertion that only he was able to understand exactly what was happening since he had the ear and the loyalty of the people; Phillips' contention that Jeffreys was being over-pessimistic and alarmist; Jeffreys agreeing to let issues rest, only to return to them with renewed vigour; Jeffreys' constant attempts to change rules so that the rules would be able to cover every eventuality; the feeling of both men that combative stances were being

taken since decisions were being proposed and made when the men were separated from each other.

However, the final split did not occur only because of Ireland. Although there was a possibility that the Irish problems would cause a split between Jeffreys and Phillips, if problems had been confined to this area alone, it probably would never have done so. The prizes were too small for either party to stake all on winning. Ultimately, despite his claims, Jeffreys could not be totally certain of his popularity with the Irish people, just as their loyalty to the administrative centre was equally tentative. However, the Irish question was a significant source of irritation that contributed to the cumulative effect of alienation and division.

2 British Israelism

For many lay people and ministers in local churches, the break with Elim was perceived to be due to Jeffreys' espousal of British Israel teaching. In fact the relationship between the issue of British Israelism and church government was so inter-related that it was impossible to separate them. British Israelism has a long history and has often been deemed to be contentious. Although in recent times adherence to British Israelism has waned dramatically, in 1954 it was estimated that the identification of the British with Israel was believed in England by 'some two million adherents within Protestant communions'.⁵²⁷ Because the concerns regarding British Israelism were central to the final split, time will be taken to briefly introduce the general theory and to explore Jeffreys' beliefs. An examination will then be undertaken into the disagreements concerning the identification within Elim.

1. A Brief History of British Israelism

Pollock describes British Israelism, or Anglo-Israelism,⁵²⁸ as the belief that,

The British nation is the 'lost' ten tribes of Israel, with one modification. It is stated that Benjamin, just before the siege of Jerusalem, broke off from Judah and attached itself to the ten tribes; and that the tribe of Manasseh, identified by the advocates of this theory as the United States of America, broke off at the same time from the ten tribes, thus leaving the number of tribes at the figure ten.⁵²⁹

⁵²⁷ Davies, H. Christian Deviations (London: SCM, 1954) 81. This figure was an estimate, the exact number of adherents is impossible to determine.

⁵²⁸ These terms had identical meanings. The term British Israel was most regularly used in Elim and by George Jeffreys. It was often abbreviated to B. I. In quoting letters, I have used the abbreviation where it appears in the original.

⁵²⁹ Pollock, A. J. 'The British Israel Theory' briefly tested by Scripture. (London: Central Truth Depot, n.d.), 2.

The fate of the ten exiled tribes of Israel is a question that became the subject of various historical and legendary theories. Hyamson commented,

In no district of the earth's surface have not the Tribes at one time or another been located; no race has escaped the honour, or the suspicion, of being descended from the subjects of Jeroboam.⁵³⁰

The perceived significance of Israel's continued existence and the identification of Israel with their own particular nationality or ethnic group was the empirical proof it provided that God could be trusted, since he had not abandoned his own people, nor had they lost their unique place in God's plans. More particularly, the groups claiming to be the lost tribes were assured that God was in a specifically unique relationship with themselves.

The Talmud contained references to the fate of the lost tribes of Israel.

Referring to the dispersal, it gave the impression that, at some stage in history, they would re-emerge from obscurity.

The Ten Tribes are not to return, for it is written: And he cast them forth into another land like (as to) this day. (Deut. 29:28) As a day goes and does not return, so they go and do not return - so R. Akiba; but R. Eleazor says, "As a day darkens and then becomes light, so they, after being in darkness, shall then have light".⁵³¹

Josephus vaguely located a group of people, 'countless myriads whose number cannot be ascertained', that he suggested had belonged to the lost ten tribes as living somewhere beyond the Euphrates.⁵³² This legendary explanation of the location of the tribes, along with subsequent speculation and accounts of Jews having met the tribe of Naphtali and received a letter from the king of the

⁵³⁰ Hyamson, A. M. "The Lost Tribes, and the Influence of the Search for Them on the Return of the Jews to England" Jewish Quarterly Review, 15, 1902-3, 640-676.

⁵³¹ b. San. 110b Babylonian Talmud ed. Epstein, I. (London: The Soncino Press, 1935).

⁵³² Josephus, (trans. R. Marcus and A. Wikgren) Antiquities of the Jews 11:133. (London: Heinemann, 1980) 377. This was commonly believed in Europe. Hyamson refers to a work by Peter Morwyng, dated 1558, which repeated this legend, 646.

Children of Moses, allowed proponents of the theory to 'prove' that the members of the tribe had 'found their way into "these isles of the west"'.⁵³³

According to Sapsworth, it was from them that 'truly evolved the English, Scotch (sic), Irish, Welsh of the British Empire, and the American of the United States'.⁵³⁴

The earliest reference in English literature to the problem of the lost tribes was in 1241 by Matthew Paris. Writing in the context of the Crusades, he recounted how the Jews believed the Tartars to be their Jewish brothers who had been recently released from captivity in the Caspian mountains, and who were now prepared to overthrow the Christian oppressors.⁵³⁵ However, Hyamson claims that it is to 'Richard Brothers (that) the peculiar sect that considers the English to be the modern representatives of Ephraim owes its origin'.⁵³⁶ Brothers was a prolific writer of pamphlets whose literary output was only interrupted by his frequent confinements in lunatic asylums.⁵³⁷ Brothers built on the works of the Puritan MP, John Sadler, who had written a Manifesto in 1649 entitled 'Rights of the Kingdom'. Sadler had attempted to prove a connection between the British constitutional system and the nation of Israel. His support for Cromwell

⁵³³ Baron, D., The History of the Ten 'Lost' Tribes: Anglo-Israelism Examined (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1915), 45.

⁵³⁴ Sapsworth, L. The Bible Arch of British Israel Truth, 94 quoted in Coates, J. R. "Cults Today" Expository Times vol. 54:12, Sept. 1943, 315.

⁵³⁵ Hyamson, 645-646. This is the earliest work linking the tribes of Israel with the Tartars. Hyamson outlines works written during the sixteenth and seventeenth century that argued about their location, which ranged from the West Indians to the Chinese, Peruvians and the native Americans. However, for the sake of this thesis I have limited myself to describing the works that identify Israel with Britain.

⁵³⁶ Ibid., 672.

⁵³⁷ Of particular importance was A Revealed Knowledge of the Prophecies and Times (1794). In 1798 he prophesied the return of the 'Hebrews' to Jerusalem. Silverman, G. E. "British Israelites," in Roth, C. ed. Encyclopaedia Judaica, (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House Ltd, 1971), 1382.

was due to the Talmud's recommendation that kings be judged.⁵³⁸ His work generally encouraged the Republicans to believe that they were restaging the battles that the people of God in the Bible had previously engaged in. Brothers' work perpetuated the folk legend that the name 'Britain' was derived from the Phoenician source, Berat Anac (meaning 'The Field of Tin and Lead'), and that the Irish Holy Stone, the Lia Fail, was the stone from the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite,⁵³⁹ taken into Solomon's Temple, and then through the travels of the tribe of Dan transported to Ireland. The Scots claimed that it subsequently came into their possession and it was identified as Jacob's pillow. After this stone was taken in a raid by Edward I, it became the Coronation Stone.⁵⁴⁰ However, the Irish claimed that it had never left the island but was buried in the hill of Tara. This hill was seen to be of great significance to the British Israelites, since the word 'Tara' was believed to be etymologically derived from 'Torah'.⁵⁴¹

538

Ibid.

539

1 Chronicles 21:22ff.

540

Hyamson, 675-676, has a detailed quotation from The Hebrew Standard, an American journal, dated 31 October 1902, which explored the 'history' of the stone. It argued that the stone under the seat of the throne in Westminster Abbey is the Bethel Stone, Jacob's Pillow, the stone upon which Hebrew kings were crowned in Jerusalem. Royalty in Britain can trace its line through to the house of David, confirmed by Irish history. Apparently, the daughter of Zedekiah married Eveahide, king of the Danites or Dalrades in Ireland in 583 B.C. in a marriage ceremony conducted by Jeremiah the prophet. They were crowned on the Bethel Stone. Eveahide was a descendant of Judah in his own right, his ancestor being Zarah, one of the twin sons of Judah, David being the other. In time through the Bruces and the Stewarts this line became the royal line. Therefore, Edward VII could be claimed to be a direct descendant of Judah, and belong to a dynasty that can never end. The royal standard includes the Irish harp, originally the harp of David, and the lions are representative of the lion of the tribe of Judah. Edward VII was named David because a friend of the family, Lady Blanche Waterford, believed in the Davidic origin of the royal house. A form of this legend was repeated in The Times, 4 July 1996: 'Legend has it that the stone was used by Jacob as a pillow when he rested his head in Bethel, and that it eventually reached Ireland by way of Egypt and Spain. In Ireland it was supposedly used as a coronation throne by the High Kings of Tara.'

541

Hyamson, 674-675.

In 1871, Edward Hine published the work, The Identification of the British Nation with the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel, and became the ablest nineteenth century apologist for the identification and it was due to him that the understanding developed and became a significant belief system within Protestantism. The appeal of British Israelism was that it was able to explain the relevance of the historical passages of Scripture. They were not merely historical records of marginal interest, but directly related to the reader since it was the reader's own history unfolding daily. It meant that people could be patriotic, and that this patriotism would be pleasing to God. It is significant that some major proponents of this view were members of the upper class establishment.⁵⁴² Indeed, within Elim, the minister that wrote most extensively concerning his views of British Israelism was James McWhirter, who had married the daughter of a general.⁵⁴³ British Israelism produced a religious gloss to explain the domination of the British Empire.

The identification of the British and American peoples with Israel, while never generally accepted amongst Pentecostals, did receive notable exposure, specifically through the writings of Charles Parham, the founding father of American Pentecostalism and William Hutchinson, the founder of the first British Pentecostal denomination. In Anglo-Israelism's emphasis on God's particular relationship with Caucasians, Parham found theological support for

⁵⁴² For example, J. McWhirter included in his book (Britain and Palestine in Prophecy (London: Methuen & Co., 1937)) an appendix with works that he felt would be of help in understanding British Israelism. It is instructive to see the titles of the authors: Brig-Gen. W.H. Fasken; Ven-Archdeacon D. Hanan; Lt-Col W.G. MacKendrick; Rev. W.M.H. Milner; Rev. J.C. Mountain; Rev. Commander L.G. Roberts; Maj-Gen H.N. Sargent; Rev. R. Thomas; Right Rev. Bishop Whitcomb.

⁵⁴³ J. C. Kennedy, Interview, op. cit.

his racism.⁵⁴⁴ Hutchinson combined this identity with an understanding of the baptism in the Spirit as God's act of recreating a people who would usher in the earthly kingdom. This resulted in a dignity and responsibility being placed upon the British and American nations that was huge and exclusive.⁵⁴⁵

2. George Jeffreys' beliefs regarding the Anglo-Israel identification

Generally, Jeffreys was unwilling to elaborate on his own beliefs concerning Britain's identification with Israel. For example, there are no known sermon manuscripts extant regarding Jeffreys' view of Israel.⁵⁴⁶ Even those that had been close to Jeffreys and his ministry claimed that they were unaware of his specific views regarding British Israelism. For example, it was only in 1940, after the severe disagreements at the Conference, that Pastor William Evans, Jeffreys' former chauffeur, was able to present a clear account of Jeffreys' beliefs. He claimed that whilst the 'Principal has shown sympathy to B.I. and had not stated his views ... I learnt more of the Principal's view on B.I. on Thursday than in all the time previously'.⁵⁴⁷ Jeffreys argued that he had never allowed this view to influence his work,⁵⁴⁸ and all that he had requested was that people would be able to exercise freedom of holding to different opinions on issues surrounding prophetic matters. Jeffreys clearly believed that British Israelism was simply one supplementary belief, amongst many, which should

⁵⁴⁴ Charles Parham, Voice Crying in the Wilderness. (n.p., 1902), 106-107. J. R. Goff, 'Fields White unto Harvest': Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism. (Fayette and London: University of Arkansas Press, 1988), 57, 101. Also Blumhofer, E. The Assemblies of God (Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1989), 75-76.

⁵⁴⁵ Hathaway, M. EPTA 16, 1996, 40-57.

⁵⁴⁶ According to Cartwright, Interview, 13 November 1995.

⁵⁴⁷ Unpublished notes of Pastor William Evans to the Coulsdon church membership post-1940 Conference.

⁵⁴⁸ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 1 December 1934.

not be proscribed.⁵⁴⁹ In 1935, Jeffreys received correspondence from Rev. J. MacDonald⁵⁵⁰ asking whether British Israelism had become part of the official doctrinal stance of Elim and whether it was being taught within the Bible College. In reply, Jeffreys stressed that tolerance was necessary regarding questions of prophetic interpretation:

There are good godly men taking opposite views on the question of British Israelism as well as on other minor questions, and we cannot afford to break the bonds of Christian unity amongst them especially in a day when all who love the Bible are needed to stand together on the Fundamentals of the Faith.⁵⁵¹

Jeffreys appeared reluctant to outline his specific views, preferring to argue that what he did believe was moderate. In 1937, replying to Phillips' question⁵⁵² whether the planned publication of the World Revival Crusade magazine would present views held to be unscriptural by the majority of Elim people, Jeffreys asked for a clearer definition of what he meant by unscriptural beliefs.⁵⁵³

Phillips outlined these beliefs as being,

that the British people are Israelites by natural birth, and the doctrines on which it depends, e.g. that our Royal family is descended from David, and that the stone of Daniel 2 is the British Empire, etc..⁵⁵⁴

Although this was a perfect opportunity for Jeffreys to explain exactly what he did believe, he refused and side-stepped the question, preferring to concentrate on the implications of the question. In particular, he pointed out

⁵⁴⁹ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 4 December 1934. Clearly Phillips had always disagreed with this view. In a Letter to Jeffreys, 20 October 1933, he mentioned that Charles Coates, a former Elim minister, and editor of the Foursquare Gospel Testimony, had been accepted by the Assemblies of God, on the understanding that he would not continue teaching his beliefs about the Pyramids or British Israelism, implying that standard orthodoxy was not compatible with British Israelism.

⁵⁵⁰ Rev. J. I. Macdonald was a regular writer in the "Morning Star" paper. This was a devotional newspaper, not the Communist paper.

⁵⁵¹ Letter, Jeffreys to Rev J. MacDonald, 9 May 1935.

⁵⁵² Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 25 January 1937.

⁵⁵³ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 26 January 1937.

⁵⁵⁴ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 26 January 1937.

that he did not understand why, if he held views that the majority felt were unscriptural, they still wanted him to remain as a spiritual leader. He acknowledged that whilst people did believe British Israelism to be erroneous, they did so, on the whole, because they had only heard the teaching presented by the more extreme adherents. Instead of reassuring the Executive Council about his own moderate views, he simply pleaded with them for freedom to preach the differing views of prophecy.⁵⁵⁵

I am inclined to believe with you that the majority of Elim people do consider B.I. to be unscriptural. But has it ever occurred to you that many of them might have received their instruction from some B.I.s who hold extreme or fanatical views? They must have received teaching on the subject from someone apart from myself, for I have not taken up the subject, certainly not since the Ministerial Conference in which it was first discussed. ... The term "British Israel" is as elastic as the term "Pentecostal" and can mean a good many things I do not believe. Let me make myself perfectly clear. I have never asked that my view of prophecy should become a plank in Elim's platform. All I have ever asked is that it should be given the same liberty in the pulpit and in the press, as is given to the other views on prophecy in Elim.⁵⁵⁶

There are four important claims in this extract, namely that Jeffreys had not publicly expressed any comment regarding the British Israel identification since 1933; that he did not hold to all the British Israel teaching; that he believed his own views to be moderate and reasonable;⁵⁵⁷ and that he had never desired to make everyone accept the identification, being content for it to be taught as an alternative to other prophetic viewpoints. It was this latter claim that Phillips disputed.

⁵⁵⁵ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 28 January 1937.

⁵⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁵⁷ Some of the teaching suggested by British Israel proponents was spurious to say the least, e.g. Coates, G. "Cults Today" Expository Times 54:12, September 1943, 315 quotes Sapsworth, "'The Israelites were obstinate and given to over-indulgence in liquor - a half-baked people. The Anglo-Saxons are like that. Therefore they are Israelites.'" Coates' wry comment is apt, 'Logic is not a strong point with 'B.I.'. Neither is a sense of humour.'

Phillips felt that it would be impossible to allow this freedom of expression since, firstly,

When one considers the time that is given in our churches and the space in the Evangel to prophecy (mostly futurism, but some historicism) then it almost makes one's hair to stand on end to imagine that time and space given over in Elim to B.I. [...] I know you differentiate between the teaching of the identity and the fanatical doctrines commonly associated with it, but let me remind you that our opposition and that of the majority of the people is the identity. That is the basic error.⁵⁵⁸

Phillips' second reason for believing that British Israelite teaching should not be encouraged was due to the division it brought to the churches when introduced. He pointed out that after the 1934 Ministerial Conference, Jeffreys himself had recognised what would happen if it was introduced into the churches. As far as Phillips was concerned, although Jeffreys had not changed his mind over the doctrine itself, he had changed his mind concerning its implementation in churches.⁵⁵⁹

By February 1937, the Executive Council had agreed to a compromise: ministers who wanted to either preach in favour of British Israelism themselves, or allow others to do so, would be able to take charge of Local Government Churches, Local Government Churches under the control of a Minister, or Sole Trustee Churches, but would not be allowed to minister in a Direct Government Church.⁵⁶⁰ A few days later, Phillips asked for an opportunity to discuss these issues face to face with Jeffreys, rather than the debate being conducted through correspondence. He referred to the fact that apparently Jeffreys had been hurt by a previous remark which had suggested that British Israelism

⁵⁵⁸ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 1 February 1937.

⁵⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁶⁰ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 8 February 1937. For ore details on the differences between these churches, see below on Church Government.

constituted 'basic error' and was an 'unscriptural doctrine'. Phillips reassured him that he had never intended to imply that Jeffreys was not being true to Elim's fundamental beliefs.⁵⁶¹ Although Jeffreys replied that he had not been hurt by the remark, Jeffreys said that whilst he had known that Phillips had understood British Israelism to be an error, this was the first inclination he had that the rest of the Executive Council agreed.⁵⁶² Considering the defeats that the identification had suffered at the Conferences, this seems an extraordinary comment to make. It is hard to believe that Jeffreys did not recognise that the antipathy to British Israelism was general, and not merely Phillips' personal *bête noire*. One is left having to decide between this being a disingenuous comment, or believing that Jeffreys had lost contact with the feelings of the Executive Council and had not understood the implications of previous events. The significance of Phillips' assertion in relation to the split is that it is an example of Jeffreys being isolated from his leaders and that isolation being firmly emphasised.

On 17 February 1937, Phillips sent a report of a meeting held between himself and Jeffreys to the Executive Council. It related to a proposal made by Jeffreys that there should be strict neutrality in all prophetic teaching. Jeffreys had suggested that although neutrality was possible, and would be maintained in the World Revival Crusade publications, this would also result in much of futurist teaching being silenced. Side-stepping this question, Phillips had

⁵⁶¹ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 13 February 1937.

⁵⁶² Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 15 February 1937. To confirm his understanding Phillips replied that 'it is a fact that none of the elected members of the Executive Council accepts the identity of Israel with the Anglo-Saxon peoples.' Letter 16 February 1937.

confronted him with his belief that the present situation had been precipitated by the fact that Jeffreys had 'got himself into a difficult position with B.I.s and Elim people, and he felt he must explain himself. Finally, he [Jeffreys] agreed that this was actually the case'.⁵⁶³

The following week witnessed the exchange of five letters discussing what a policy of 'neutrality' would involve in practice. Since it became clear that it would result in ministers not being able to refer to Jews or Israel at all, the Executive Council felt that such a policy would be totally impractical. For them, the only solution was for Jeffreys either to cease to be the leader of the work, or for them to allow total freedom for the teaching of British Israelism in the churches. Since they did not desire the former, and believed that the latter would split the churches, they asked him to explain his position so that the work would not be destroyed.⁵⁶⁴ Jeffreys' solution to the situation was to drop the subject of British Israel altogether and to request that he be elected as a leader each year.

Jeffreys never wrote directly about British Israel in the Elim Evangel. He always argued that he had been very careful not to destabilise the work by putting his views into print. The nearest he came to outlining his views in the Elim Evangel was in the issue dedicated to the coronation of King George in 1937.⁵⁶⁵ The article drew upon British Israelite imagery in describing the ceremony and extracting devotional thoughts from it. Jeffreys began the article

⁵⁶³ Phillips, Unpublished Notes circularised to the Executive Council, 17 February 1937.

⁵⁶⁴ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 23 February 1937.

⁵⁶⁵ Jeffreys, G. "A Momentous Day in History" Elim Evangel 7 May 1937, 296-297.

by pointing out that 'the subjects of the greatest Empire the world has known' along with 'our cousins in the great American Continent' would wish God's blessing upon the Royal House. Turning his attention to some of the ceremonial aspects, he mentioned the use of the Jerusalem Chamber, lined with cedar wood from Lebanon, mirroring the decoration of the Temple in Jerusalem, the site of the coronation of David. He pointed out that the choristers would sing the same Psalm 122, as was sung at David's coronation, and as the new King was presented to the heads of the Commonwealth, 'we (will) think of the first King who was presented to a nation of different tribes nearly three thousand years ago'. The National Anthem, based on 1 Samuel 10:24 would be sung, after which the King would be anointed with oil, resulting in him being 'set apart to a Holy Office as the "Lord's Anointed"'. Appealing to history, he recounted the story of Edward the Confessor, the religiously minded monarch, who was so impressed with this feature of the Coronation service, that he claimed for all anointed kings the miraculous power to heal sickness' by the touch of the royal hand. The 'Stone of Destiny', upon which the King would be crowned, was identified as the stone used by Athaliah in the Bible (2 Kings 11:13,14). To the general reader, it was merely an interesting article outlining the procedures surrounding the Coronation, but for those who recognised the references, Jeffreys' British Israel beliefs were being outlined.

The only other extant article which attempted to summarise his views on British Israelism pre-1940 is one written 'some years' before it was finally published,

but which had been 'left as it was written'.⁵⁶⁶ It was written as a reply to the many letters he had received inquiring about his beliefs, some of which showed 'glaring misrepresentations of my personal views on Israel'.⁵⁶⁷ He outlined the four different schools of prophetic teaching that were current in Elim, i.e. futurist, historicist, harmonist⁵⁶⁸ and national- historicist.⁵⁶⁹ He wrote that he had held to the national-historicist understanding of prophecy since the formation of Elim in 1915. His definition of the national-historicist school was that

God is restoring Israel as a servant-nation in the Celto-Anglo-Saxon peoples as the descendants of the 10-tribed Kingdom of Israel, just as the Jews are the descendants of the Kingdom of Judah.⁵⁷⁰

Jeffreys believed that although all Jews were Israelites, not all Israelites were Jews. Secondly, although the greater part of Israel was lost for a time, they could now be identified as the Celto-Anglo-Saxon race. Thirdly, salvation was only appropriated through the death of Christ, which all had to accept as efficacious,⁵⁷¹ consequently, if the Celto-Anglo-Saxon people rejected Christ they would face greater condemnation due to their heritage. Finally, he believed that people needed to repent and return to God. He then explained some different identifications of the Jews with other ethnic groupings, ranging from the Japanese to the North-western Indians, although he accepted that some did believe that the ten tribes were irretrievably lost. However, he argued that people should be given freedom to express their own understanding of the

⁵⁶⁶ Jeffreys, G. "My Attitude towards the Prophetic Schools", The Pattern, January 1940, 6-8. He claimed that he had not been allowed to publish his views in the Elim Evangel, and so was taking the opportunity afforded to him by the publication of The Pattern.

⁵⁶⁷ Ibid., 6

⁵⁶⁸ A fusion of futurism and historicism.

⁵⁶⁹ i.e. British- Israelism.

⁵⁷⁰ Ibid., 7

⁵⁷¹ A point he made clear in the letter to J. I. Macdonald, 9 May 1935.

question. This article, whilst breaking Jeffreys' silence on the issue, did not go into any further details concerning his own understanding. The article was published after he had broken from Elim and so he felt free to publicise his viewpoint. The fact that he was cautious in outlining his views suggests that he was concerned to attract ministers and members to his cause and so did not want to alienate them with doctrines that would appear to be esoteric.

The other indication of what Jeffreys believed is found in the writing of James McWhirter. In 1935, a small party of the Elim leaders⁵⁷² went to Palestine for an extended visit, 21 February - 10 April. The actual reason for the tour was never directly given, at least on paper, but one of the results of this trip was the publication of McWhirter's book, Britain and Palestine in Prophecy. This book was part-travelogue, part-apology for British Israelism. In a circular to the Executive Council commenting on recent correspondence with Jeffreys, Phillips wrote,

He [Jeffreys] said that he thought that McWhirter's book would be banned in Elim Churches, but that he would naturally have to push it.⁵⁷³

It can be assumed, therefore, that the teaching contained in the book contains indications of Jeffreys' own beliefs. It was during this period, i.e. after the tour of Palestine and before the major conference problems, that Phillips began to show concern about the extent to which Elim was being linked up with British

⁵⁷² Jeffreys, Phillips, Edsor, McWhirter, Corry. The cost of the trip was £200. Phillips was aware of the embarrassment that could be caused by the expense of the journey. He raised the potential problem of the cost of the trip in a letter to Jeffreys, commenting that it was 'principally through the help of a friend that you are going, but, of course, we recently had an editorial to the effect that we have no rich friends - no, I think we said, few!' Letter Phillips to Jeffreys, 30 January 1935.

⁵⁷³ Circular to Executive Council, Phillips, 20 January 1937.

Israelism due to the views held, and propagated, by Jeffreys. He wrote to Jeffreys,

After hearing you and Mr McWhirter speak of your acceptance of the British-Israel identity to such a big proportion of people we entered into conversation with on the tour, one wonders how far we are being linked up with B.I. through the Revival Party.⁵⁷⁴

McWhirter argued that America was the tribe of Manasseh, 'a great people', with Britain being Ephraim, 'a Nation and a company of Nations'. He claimed that the identifications 'historically, ethnologically and religiously are legion'.⁵⁷⁵ The identification centred on historical arguments. He believed that the tribes made their way to Britain via the sea-trading routes that had been in place before the time of Solomon, and that the Stone of Bethel (Gen. 28:18) was the Coronation Stone used for crowning monarchs since 1298.⁵⁷⁶ The inhabitants of Britain were claimed to have descended from one racial stock, 'which would be conceivable if they are the tribes of Israel'.⁵⁷⁷ He argued that the Israelites had migrated from Assyria across the Euphrates to the south of Russia, and from there had moved through Europe to Scandinavia, until they reached the British Isles. He wrote,

The prophecies fulfilled in history, the Apocrypha, inscriptions on stone, and legendary histories are the links which form the chain of evidence. These are the isles of the north and west so often referred to in prophecy.⁵⁷⁸

⁵⁷⁴ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 7 May 1935.

⁵⁷⁵ McWhirter, 8. The book was not published by the Elim Publishing Company because of its contents. Methuen agreed to publish it on the recommendation of a relative of Edsor who worked in the company.

⁵⁷⁶ Ibid., 34.

⁵⁷⁷ Ibid., 36.

⁵⁷⁸ Ibid., 31.

It was claimed that the royal line of Britain had been preserved because of the connection with the line of Judah, thereby becoming the recipient of the promise regarding the eternal kingdom. That the promises to David did not refer to Judah, and therefore the Jews, could be confirmed since the Jews had never had an appointed place to settle throughout their existence; they had been scattered throughout the world, without a king.⁵⁷⁹ However, these promises had been preserved in the line of Israel. Repeating the traditional British Israel understanding of the development of the royal family, he reiterated the legend of the marriage of Zedekiah's daughter, and the route that the 'Stone of Destiny' had made from Bethel to Westminster Abbey.⁵⁸⁰

In particular, the two promises to Abraham had been fulfilled in Britain. Britain's maritime power was a fulfilment of the prophecy, 'His seed shall be in many waters and his kingdom shall be exalted'.⁵⁸¹ More specifically, the promise, 'Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies', was believed to have been fulfilled in the British empire.⁵⁸² Referring to the extent of the British Empire marked on the map,

⁵⁷⁹ Ibid., 33.

⁵⁸⁰ Ibid., 33-35.

⁵⁸¹ Ibid., 38.

⁵⁸² The 'gates' are taken to refer to the Suez canal, the shipping route past Malta and Gibraltar.

Phillips refers to this belief in a Letter to Jeffreys, 31 January 1935, regarding the plans for the Palestine trip, 'we will actually cross over the Suez Canal, quite close to where your *self-claimed ancestors* crossed, for that part of the Red Sea is now the Suez canal'. Reflecting some of the discussions that took place on the tour, Phillips sent a cutting from the Morning Post prefacing it with the statement, 'With reference to the B.I. claim to Suez as a "Gate", and also to a claim made recently that Egypt was British, watered down to a claim when we were crossing the Suez that at any rate we were now in the British Empire, which latter claim was watered down on opposition being met, to the statement that what really mattered was who would hold the Suez canal in the time of war.' Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 24 May 1935.

It appears nothing short of miraculous that the peoples of these little islands on the fringe of Europe are in control of the strategic positions of the whole world.⁵⁸³

For McWhirter, there could be only one reason for this success. The Empire was immune from the threat from other nations because they were the people of God, and God had covenanted himself to his own people. The second promise to Abraham, 'And in thy seed all nations of the earth will be blessed because thou hast obeyed my voice' was taken to refer, self-evidently for him, to the British Empire.⁵⁸⁴ It could not refer to Israel before Christ, or the Jews since, nor could the disciples' success be the referent, since this was achieved in spite of Jewish opposition. For McWhirter, and supporters of the British Israel identity, the blessing obviously referred to the British Empire, and this was authenticated by the prosperity and dominion that the British exercised over the whole world.

The final argument regarding the identification pointed to the belief that it proved the world to be entering the final phase before Christ's return. If the identification was wrong, then

the Second Advent of Christ may still be a long way off, for such an empire as ours must arise in the world and do the work that the British Empire is doing.⁵⁸⁵

The possibility that the second advent was not imminent was taken to be self-evidently erroneous, since the outpouring of the Spirit they had experienced had proved to them beyond doubt that they were living in the 'last days' referred to in Acts 2:17. McWhirter's expectation was that Britain would

⁵⁸³ McWhirter, 74.

⁵⁸⁴ Ibid., 76.

⁵⁸⁵ Ibid., 8.

enter into a period of revival, triggered by the nation recognising its identity with Israel, which would inaugurate the return of Christ.

The British Israel theory was comprehensive and was one that Jeffreys held to wholeheartedly. However, Phillips remained unconvinced. His comment in 1939 summarised much of the debate between Phillips and Jeffreys over the previous seven years:

Personally I am so convinced of the error of B.I. that I regret that years ago we did not take a definite stand against it in pulpit and Evangel. I agree with the late F.B. Meyer when he said, "B.I. is not capable of argument, it is a kind of infatuation".⁵⁸⁶

Phillips regarded Jeffreys as obsessive in his desire to allow the identification of Britain with Israel to become a supplementary doctrine within Elim.

However, it will also be seen that Phillips became equally obsessed in his desire to halt Jeffreys' plans. The roots of Jeffreys' infatuation with this doctrine will now be examined.

3. Reasons for Jeffreys' acceptance of the identification

Although Hollenweger indicated that Jeffreys' commitment to British Israelism lay in his acceptance of the Celtic myth that equated the Welsh people with the lost tribes of Israel,⁵⁸⁷ there is no evidence that Jeffreys was influenced by this theory. The most likely reason for Jeffreys' acceptance of the theory is due to his relationship with John Leech. Although this is asserted, though not proven, by Cartwright,⁵⁸⁸ the material below will demonstrate the links between the two men and present a compelling argument for Leech's influence upon Jeffreys.

⁵⁸⁶ Letter Phillips to P.G. Parker, 10 March 1939.

⁵⁸⁷ Hollenweger, (1988), 194.

⁵⁸⁸ Cartwright, 120.

John Leech (1857-1942) was one of the most influential men in the origins and development of the Elim denomination, although his contribution to the early development of the Movement has generally been overlooked. Part of this reason is patently because of his support for British-Israelism and his perceived influence on Jeffreys. After the split, he was treated with complete suspicion and ostracised since he publicly pledged his support for the Bible Pattern Church Fellowship,⁵⁸⁹ becoming its vice-president until his death. John Leech was appointed General Commissioner of the British-Israel Federation in July 1926. The Elim Evangel⁵⁹⁰ carried a report of his farewell from Belfast. It is pertinent to note that at this stage in Elim's history there seemed to be no problem with a close relationship being expressed between the Movement and the identification theory. The report expressed pleasure at the fact that Leech's appointment would result in him being nearer to the centre of the Elim work in London.

On the occasion of becoming the General Commissioner The National Message and Banner listed his achievements.⁵⁹¹ These are impressive.

Leech had been the First Honoursman of Trinity College, Dublin; the Plunket Gold Medallist for Oratory (Legal Debating); member of the Bar of Ireland, a King's Counsel, a Bencher of the Honourable Society of King's Inns and a Bencher of the Inn of Court of Northern Ireland. He was also Senior Crown Prosecutor for County Longford and Chairman of the Incorporated Council of

⁵⁸⁹ The name was suggested by Leech. Jeffreys, G. foreword to Constitution of the Bible Pattern Church Fellowship, 1955, 1.

⁵⁹⁰ "Items of Interest" Elim Evangel, 1 July 1926, 154-155.

⁵⁹¹ "John Leech" The National Message and Banner, 18 September 1926, 580. This was the magazine of the British Israel World Federation.

Law reporting for Northern Ireland. He was an additional judge at Belfast Recorder's Court and of the County Court of Antrim. He was Commissioner for the Reconstitution of District Electoral Divisions of Northern Ireland and the Chairman of Trade Boards. Until he left Dublin to live in Belfast, he was a member of the Dublin Diocesan Synod of the Church of Ireland and of the Dublin Diocesan Council; also Judge of the Court of the Diocesan Synod and President of the Irish Church Union. On being offered the position of General Commissioner, he resigned from his legal responsibilities, the explanation being offered that he had taken this course, 'in order to devote the remainder of his life to the great work of the British-Israel Federation, which he considers of more importance than any other Movement today.'⁵⁹² He served on various missionary,⁵⁹³ religious and charitable committees, and held missions in various churches in both Ireland and England.

Leech's legal career, combined with his spiritual prowess, made him a formidable ally for George Jeffreys. The impact that a man of this calibre would have had on George Jeffreys, and the help that he would have been able to give the fledgling Movement, would have been immense. However, it is extraordinary to note that whilst Leech was clearly close to Jeffreys, and preached at many of the Elim Conventions and took part in the Ministerial business sessions, he remained a member of the Church of Ireland, rather than joining one of the Elim churches.⁵⁹⁴

⁵⁹² Ibid.

⁵⁹³ He was a member of the Council of the Pentecostal Missionary Union. "The Pentecostal Missionary Union" Confidence October-December 1918, 71.

⁵⁹⁴ Edsor, Interview op. cit.

4. John Leech and the development of Elim

Leech had been one of the guest speakers at the Sunderland Conventions in both 1913 and 1914. On both occasions, he preached in the Sunday evening services.⁵⁹⁵ In 1913, George Jeffreys was invited to give evangelistic messages at the close of each evening, following the guest speakers. His preaching made a considerable impact upon the visitors to the Conference,⁵⁹⁶ and it is clear how these two men would be drawn to each other. Jeffreys' fiery evangelistic passion, and Leech's 'great talents for conducting special evangelistic missions'⁵⁹⁷ would make a powerful combination and a natural friendship. It seems probable that this was the first occasion that George Jeffreys met John Leech. They ministered together at the same event again in 1915, at Caxton Hall, Westminster.⁵⁹⁸

Boulton gave no account of how Jeffreys first met Leech, although Leech, writing the foreword to Boulton's early history, referred to himself as 'one who has observed this work commenced by George Jeffreys from its small beginnings to its present wonderful development'.⁵⁹⁹ Boulton made it clear that Leech and Jeffreys evangelised together in February 1916. He quoted a Ballymena newspaper report detailing the activity and results of their joint ministry.⁶⁰⁰ Shortly after this campaign, in the summer of 1916, Leech and

⁵⁹⁵ Gee, (1967) 77.

⁵⁹⁶ Cartwright (36) quotes from a German Pentecostal paper that reported 'The twelve Revivalists from Wales took a great part in making this Convention full of life ... On Whit Monday, May 12th, George spoke in the main hall which was crowded to the doors with an overflow into the streets.'

⁵⁹⁷ Gee, (1967) 77.

⁵⁹⁸ Due to the outbreak of war, Sunderland was considered too dangerous for these gatherings.

⁵⁹⁹ Boulton, iii.

⁶⁰⁰ Ibid., 36

Thomas Hackett were invited to become advisory members of the Evangelistic Council, 'formed with a view to overseeing the general direction of the work'.⁶⁰¹

From correspondence written in 1934, it is clear that Jeffreys accepted the British-Israel identification from around 1919 onwards,⁶⁰² and it was his ongoing relationship with Leech that provoked concern among members of the Executive Council. Jeffreys' acceptance of the identification had been public knowledge from 1925. During that year Boulton wrote to Phillips expressing his concern about Jeffreys and the 'Anglo-Israel teaching' that he understood had been introduced into the Alliance churches in London, and, to his mind more alarmingly, into the Bible College through John Leech, since he was a visiting lecturer at the College at this time. Boulton felt that this would have a detrimental effect upon the students' later ministry. He trusted that Phillips would use his influence to 'prevent our work being permeated with it'. He closed his comments with the warning that 'if [it is] left untouched it will in time leaven the whole of the work'.⁶⁰³ In the same month, Charles Kingston wrote an article in the Elim Evangel that acknowledged the debate that there was concerning the identity of Israel. Referring to the 'elect' he said,

At present the lost ten tribes of Israel are unidentified. It is thought by some that the British nation together with the Americans are these ten tribes. Whether that be so or not (and one has not the space to discuss the pros and cons of this theory) all uncertainty will end when the angels are sent to gather the lost tribes.⁶⁰⁴

⁶⁰¹ Ibid., 38.

⁶⁰² Letter Jeffreys to Phillips, 1 December 1934: 'My attitude towards B.I. today is what it has been for fifteen years.'

⁶⁰³ Letter, Boulton to Phillips, 30 November 1925.

⁶⁰⁴ Kingston, C.J. "The Coming of Christ and After." Elim Evangel 16 November 1925, 255.

In 1934, members of the Executive Council suggested that the reason Jeffreys was attempting to introduce church governmental changes was due to the influence that John Leech was exercising over him concerning British Israelism. They suggested that Leech's influence should be curbed and his relationship with the Elim Movement be silenced by no pictures of him being included in any future copies of the Elim Evangel. Jeffreys replied, hinting that if such a course of action was taken, he would be tempted to tender his resignation,

If they penalise him because of anything I have suggested, it is only the grace of God that can save the iron from going into my soul, and it is only love for the churches I have, through Grace, founded that will enable me to suffer ... such an affront to a true and tried brother and friend of Elim's of twenty years standing.⁶⁰⁵

5. The British Israel debates at Conference⁶⁰⁶

Outwardly, at least, Jeffreys attempted to give the impression of a man who was content to hold his own view as simply one among many. The minutes of the Conferences held from 1932 onwards show a different story. The question was raised at the Northern District conference on Tuesday 24 October 1932. The minutes simply record that British Israelism was briefly discussed, when the Principal made a proposal that Elim should allow British-Israelism to be supported by ministers.

In the following year, at the first full Conference of the Elim ministers, the whole question of eschatology was raised, including the belief in a partial rapture.⁶⁰⁷

Regarding British Israel teaching, a show of hands indicated that only 16

⁶⁰⁵ Letter Jeffreys to Phillips, 1 December 1934.

⁶⁰⁶ All the details of the Conference decisions and discussions are taken from the unpublished minutes of the Conferences.

⁶⁰⁷ After discussion, it was discovered that only one member of the Conference, Pastor Coffin, upheld this teaching.

members of the Conference accepted the identity. After discussion, it was agreed that it 'should neither be preached nor attacked in our churches, and that it should be referred to in a Supplementary Statement of Belief.' The futurist and historicist schools of interpretation would also be included in this supplementary statement of belief.⁶⁰⁸

The Conference in 1934 saw the staging of a debate on the whole question. Originally, Pastor Corry, the Dean of the Bible College, was to speak against the identification, whilst John Leech would speak for the identification. For undisclosed reasons,⁶⁰⁹ on the evening prior to the debate, Corry refused to present the case. This meant that Phillips had to enter the debate against Leech. The discussions stretched over Tuesday 18 and Wednesday 19 September. The arguments that Phillips used were predominantly pragmatic.⁶¹⁰ The overall impression given was that the Elim work would be distracted by the introduction of such teaching, and in the interests of seeing the work continue successfully, it was necessary to avoid allowing the identification of Britain with Israel to be taught in the churches.

Phillips began his speech by pointing to the harm being done to the work because of the introduction of British Israelism. He asserted that preoccupation with the identification diverted attention from more significant matters, particularly evangelism. He pointed to the evidence of churches

⁶⁰⁸ Minute 21 September 1933.

⁶⁰⁹ Cartwright (121) implies that Corry feared Leech's rhetorical skill.

⁶¹⁰ Phillips' arguments have been reconstructed from the notes that he used. (See Appendix 2) Unfortunately the notes that Leech used, if they ever existed, have not been preserved.

becoming inward-looking when they had become involved in the issue.

Secondly, he claimed that there had been 'no end of rubbish' preached,⁶¹¹

particularly amongst the younger ministers who had only been reading British

Israel publications. He continued his argument by pointing to the damaging

effects that would be caused in the churches. He argued that the church

members would not be satisfied by the concentration on the identity question.

He felt that Elim's major concerns were, and should remain, Pentecostal

matters, and in particular focus on the Baptism in the Spirit. Experience had

taught that where British Israel teaching had been introduced, division was the

inevitable result. He felt that it would also lead to the possibility that other

debatable issues, such as Eternal Security, would become the focus for

congregations, and that therefore their spiritual energies would be dissipated.

Acceptance of the identification would lead to 'double opposition'⁶¹² from people

in the mainstream denominations since the Elim members would be attacked

for holding to erroneous doctrines as well as being Pentecostal.

Phillips also pointed to the evidence of Elim's history. They had prospered

without introducing this identification, so there was no good reason why they

should do so now. It was not part of the Great Commission, nor was it part of

the 'Faith once delivered unto the Saints', but was a terrible risk and of little

ultimate value. His final point outlined his fear that if Jeffreys continued to

preach the doctrine, 'our people will go to B.I. meetings, and (the) present

problems (will be) intensified'.⁶¹³ On Phillips' notes, there are three final points

⁶¹¹ Ibid.

⁶¹² Ibid.

⁶¹³ Ibid.

in brackets, points that seem to have been added during the debate itself. He claimed that the British Israelite teaching overshadowed the miracles of Jesus and elements of fulfilled prophecy by identifying the 'Bride of Christ'⁶¹⁴ solely with Israel. He summarised the case against acceptance of the identification by claiming that the whole teaching yielded no real advantage, except to draw in a few British Israel adherents, 'to spread their strange beliefs'.

The result of the voting, indicating acceptance or rejection of British Israelism, was as follows:

	Accept	Reject	Neutral	Total
Ministers - members of Conference	13	44	21	78
Ministers - not of Conference	0	1	1	2
Probationers - under Direct Government	2	12	7	21
Sisters in Ministry	0	5	2	7
Wives of Ministers or Probationers	1	11	9	21
Any Others (J. Leech)	1	0	0	1
Category not marked on Voting Paper	0	0	1	1
Total	17	73	41	131

The result of the debate and the vote was that an agreement was made that British Israelism should neither be preached nor attacked in any Elim church under Direct Government, nor should any Elim minister appear on a British Israel platform. If a church was not under Direct Government than it would be

⁶¹⁴ Understood from Ephesians 5:32.

allowed to advocate the identification, 'within certain limits'. In the light of the fact that the British Israel contingent only received 13% of the vote, it may be understandable that Jeffreys was embarrassed by this and wished to keep the true situation secret from the other ministers. Therefore, the minute for this item closed with the comment, 'At the request of the Principal the result of the voting was not announced to the meeting'. It is intriguing that this was allowed. It is possible that there was no desire, having defeated Jeffreys, to humiliate him. However, in 1939, reflecting on this debate, Phillips said, 'This is when our serious troubles in Elim began - and they began over B.I.'⁶¹⁵

Since only Phillips' notes have been retained, it is unfortunate that Leech's arguments cannot also be viewed. However, the pragmatic nature of Phillips' argument needs to be stressed. He presented no theological interaction at all. There are a number of possible reasons for this omission. Firstly, since he had had to prepare at short notice, he may not have had time to prepare along such lines. Secondly, he may have felt that Leech would have defeated him on theological grounds. Thirdly, he may have recognised that the issue was not primarily about theological differences, but concerned the dangers in church life that would occur if the identification was allowed. Finally, he may have felt that British-Israelism was such a nonsense that it did not deserve the dignity of being taken seriously theologically. The last two options seem the most probable. The significant outcome of the debate was that Phillips defeated the impressive King's Counsel. That defeat had been inflicted in a fight for the

⁶¹⁵ Phillips, Appendix 1.

churches. Phillips, in 1934, had begun to stake the ground that he would seek to maintain over the next six years. The fights over all the various issues was to be for the churches, not for the theological truths that stood behind the issues. Because Phillips consistently argued against issues that he felt would become troublesome for the ministers, on the grounds of excluding troublemakers rather than on abstruse theological grounds, he was always going to be likely to retain the support of the majority of ministers. The charismatic leader was able to offer them positions of significance, leading churches of 500 people, but he was unable to protect them from the troublemakers within these numbers. Indeed, Jeffreys seemed to exacerbate potential problems, whereas Phillips appeared to desire to defend the ministers. Although the final split was years away, the battleground had begun to be marked out.

The following year, 1935, Jeffreys demonstrated his stubbornness by once again raising the question of the liberty to advocate British Israelism in Direct Government churches. On Monday 20 October, another questionnaire was circularised concerning dissatisfaction in the understanding of eschatological affairs. The results were tabulated as follows:

	Brethren & Sister Evangelists	Other Sisters
As regards Futurist Interpretation:		
Do you accept it?	51	17
reject it?	9	2
Are you neutral?	16	7
Total	76	26

Regarding Historicist Interpretation		
Do you accept it?	44	15
reject it?	7	6
Are you neutral?	25	6
Total	76	27
Regarding British Israel		
Do you accept it?	18	4
reject it?	35	10
Are you neutral?	27	13
Total	80	27
Are you in favour of giving liberty to preach the 3 above schools of thought.	Yes - 27 No - 46 Total - 73	8 15 23
If you are not in favour of all 3, put a line through the one or ones you consider should not be taught or opposed: Futurist Historicist B.I.	3 4 53	2 3 19 ¹
¹ The numbers indicate the positions which people felt should not be referred to in the churches. Since there is no record of the total number of people voting and since the numbers are not always in agreement, one can only assume that there were a number of abstentions.		

It was clear that the majority were unhappy with the prospect of accepting the British Israel identification. The following day, the controversy was noted again in the minutes:

A serious difference of opinion amongst members of the Executive Council was disclosed and the meeting broke up without any resolution in sight.⁶¹⁶

On Thursday 24 October, Phillips tabled the following motion,

That this Conference desires to place on record that while it has never imposed any definite ban on the teaching of B.I. in any Elim church, its ministers mutually agree that for the purpose of preserving unity it shall treat the teaching of B.I. in the same way as is the custom with other matters on which there is an acute difference of opinion, viz. neither to propagate it nor attack it in any Direct Government Church. It further puts on record that for the same reason it considers it inadvisable for

⁶¹⁶ Minutes of Tuesday evening session 22 October 1935.

any Elim minister under Direct Government to appear on any B.I. platform.

This was accepted and the Conference closed on the Friday with an agreement not to let the issue become divisive again.

However, the issue was raised again in 1937 by Jeffreys. The events of 1937 were further complicated by the birth of the World Revival Crusade. Phillips, in attempting to negotiate on behalf of the Executive Council, assured George Jeffreys that a permanent settlement was possible because of the way that the situation regarding British Israelism was being handled:

If we had bottled up any strong feelings by placing a ban on B.I. then there might be a danger. But let me remind you that we have not done this. We have put B.I. on the same basis as Eternal Security and other similar debatable subjects which hardly ever fail to bring about disunity.⁶¹⁷

Before the Conference, Phillips sent notes to the other members of the Executive regarding their own preparation for the Conference. During this period Phillips was ill and unable to attend any public functions. Since he realised he would be absent from the Conference, he dictated his notes from his bed. These notes formed the basis of a plan of attack that could be used against Jeffreys. He suggested that:

1. Jeffreys would argue that the Executive had not been neutral regarding B.I. They were told to read through the extensive correspondence between Jeffreys and himself.
2. Jeffreys would make use of the argument from "conscience", but they must not take any notice of this, since 'he was prepared to drop entirely all prophetic teaching. He has confirmed to me by word, that he actually meant what he said'. Therefore, his claim to be 'conscience-led' was a complete fabrication.
3. Jeffreys wanted freedom to preach anything that was not contrary to the Fundamentals, but that would open the door to many other heresies.
4. Jeffreys would argue that he had not changed his position. However, at the 1934 Conference, 'he was quite definite that B.I. should not be

⁶¹⁷

Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys 8 February 1937.

preached in our Churches'. Phillips informed them that recently, Jeffreys had told him that had he known what the attitude had been to British Israelism before he had signed the Deed Poll, he would not have done so. However, 'I made no reply to him, but the answer is obvious, for he signed the Deed Poll in April 1934, and at the Conference in 1934 he was one with us in our attitude to B.I. teaching'.

5. If the new magazine, the World Revival Crusade magazine, was discussed, it had to be emphasised that it contained much material supportive of the B.I. identification.
6. If voting was to take place then care needed to be taken. Phillips, reminding them, said, 'You will remember the difficulty we had in 1935 Conference'.⁶¹⁸

The Conference was introduced to the question of the British Israel identification on Tuesday, 14 September, when the ministers witnessed a 'full and free discussion about the correspondence between the Principal and the Executive Council' regarding the attitude of the Movement to British Israelism.⁶¹⁹ Jeffreys' solution was to suggest that none of the three schools of thought, i.e. historicism, futurism or British Israelism (national historicism) should be taught in the future. His intention was that prophetic teaching would be non-controversial, in that it would only stress the general areas of agreement, presumably that Jesus would return and temporal history concluded, but that it would not refer to any of the interpretative differences. This naive proposal was backed by Samuel Gorman and endorsed by the Conference. The resolution was,

This Conference is of the opinion that there is sufficient common ground in the main schools of prophecy to allow scope for teaching on this point without encroaching on debatable grounds of prophetic interpretation, and that where difficulties arise in a local church over the teaching of debatable points of prophecy, the ministers of such churches should be requested to keep to common ground.⁶²⁰

⁶¹⁸ Letter, Phillips to Pastors Boulton, Hathaway, Corry, Kingston, and Smith, 7 September 1937. The 'difficulty' was not fully described but could refer to the public discussions between members of the Executive Council.

⁶¹⁹ Minutes Wednesday 15 September 1937.

⁶²⁰ Ibid.

The minutes record that, 'There was such intense desire to find a satisfactory solution to our difficulty, that this suggestion was welcomed.'⁶²¹ Strengthening the resolution, Corry proposed that the resolution of the 1935 Ministerial Conference should be reaffirmed. Fifty-nine voted in favour, 21 were against, with 6 abstentions. It was agreed by a majority decision that the Elim Evangel should carry a report of the proceedings. The report subsequently presented a very candid account of the Conference. It attempted to counter the rumours that had circulated, firstly that George Jeffreys was to leave and establish a new and separate movement. It was reported that, 'the Principal had never for one moment entertained the thought of leaving Elim'.⁶²² Secondly, it rejected the suggestion that British Israelism would be introduced into Elim stating that,

It was made perfectly plain at the Conference that Principal Jeffreys never wanted to make the identity of the Anglo-Saxon people with Israel a plank in Elim's platform.

However, the final comment revealed that the issue had not been dealt with finally, since Jeffreys remained 'just as free today as ever he was to preach what he believes to be of God'.⁶²³

Ironically, the final Conference decision regarding the British Israel question was in 1940, after Jeffreys' resignation. It was agreed that all the doctrinal questions would be decided by the Governing Body, with liberty of expression for different interpretations of prophecy in local churches.⁶²⁴ This was passed with 83 in favour, and 72 against. The fact that Conference were prepared to pass its 'freedom of conscience' decision in 1940, albeit by a narrow margin,

⁶²¹ Ibid.

⁶²² "The Ministerial Conference of 1937" Elim Evangel, 15 October 1937, 667-668.

⁶²³ Ibid.

⁶²⁴ Minutes 20 May 1940.

suggests that Jeffreys had been more persuasive than had been admitted. The Conference presumably felt able to pass the resolution because of Jeffreys' resignation and since British Israelism had been effectively expelled from the Movement. In debating the issue of British Israelism in the context of the changes in local church government, the basic suspicion among the majority of the Executive Council, and senior ministers, was that Jeffreys' suggested alterations were a ruse whereby British Israel teaching could be introduced into the churches.⁶²⁵

6. Conclusion

Jeffreys raised the issue year after year. This does not present a picture of a man content merely to hold private opinions, willing to keep his minority views to himself. He was a man obsessed with his own interpretation of Scripture, desiring to propagate this view and proselytise as many as possible. By raising the same discussion annually, he had believed it possible to effect a central change in the thinking of the ministers. However, it had the opposite effect. By adhering to a concept that most ministers believed to be inherently divisive, Jeffreys allowed Phillips to consistently defeat him publicly, on the grounds that Jeffreys' beliefs were not helpful to the churches. Phillips did not trust Jeffreys' motivation in holding to British Israelism, and was prepared to allow the public to be aware of that fact. For both men, the issue became an obsession and all the other issues were seen in the light of this. However, in 1934, by allowing

⁶²⁵ As early as 1934, Jeffreys strongly rejected that charge. (Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 1 December 1934) Phillips, in answering this letter, apologised for questioning Jeffreys' motives, but added 'you can't blame them for looking for something that did not appear on the surface'. (Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 3 December 1934).

himself to be placed into a confrontation with Jeffreys, through Leech, Phillips had assured himself of ultimate victory in the drama played out for control of the Movement. Phillips had to be wise in the days ahead, but if Phillips is correct in saying the problems stemmed from that period, it is also true that his victory stems from that period. The unanswerable question regards Jeffreys' stubbornness in replaying the arguments in public year by year. The most plausible explanation for this self-destructive action lies in his personality: that he was convinced of his ability to discern truth and, in the midst of overwhelming opposition, was willing to take a stand for truth held by a small minority of people. This desire for an arena for his individualist approach to ministry was seen in the formation of the World Revival Crusade. This will be examined next.

3 The World Revival Crusade

An additional ingredient to the growing suspicion and division between Jeffreys and the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance was marked by the introduction of the World Revival Crusade in 1936. This was another significant factor in causing the division.

1. Precursors of the World Revival Crusade

George Jeffreys had always recognised a need for an inter-denominational network that would enable him to stay in touch with the people who had attended his campaign meetings. He wanted to be able to publicise meetings to sympathetic supporters directly, and knew that if a network existed he would receive financial support, even though the supporters continued to be members of other churches.⁶²⁶ The World Revival Crusade was such a network. It had its parentage in the Foursquare Gospel Testimony, which had been formed in 1927, the purpose of which had been 'to raise a testimony in the British Isles and abroad for the Foursquare Gospel' among 'isolated saints in remote parts of the country who are not privileged with fellowship gatherings'.⁶²⁷ To join the

⁶²⁶ Even after the split and the merging of the World Revival Crusade with the Pattern Fellowship, Jeffreys would launch another interdenominational network in 1945. The 'Faith and Freedom Covenant' was launched after Jeffreys' visit to Northern Ireland. It was established to 'keep in touch with his scattered people'. Significantly, its concern was not to keep people informed of evangelistic matters, but to stand for the establishment of churches on Biblical lines.

The membership card asked prospective members to sign the following:

'We, the undersigned BELIEVERS, by the help of God, COVENANT earnestly to contend for THE FAITH, as revealed in the whole Inspired Bible; to assist by prayer and service in broadcasting the whole counsel of God to the Individual, the church, the Nation, and the World; and for Trust Deeds that will assure congregations of the right to FREEDOM of WORSHIP and a controlling voice in Church buildings that have been paid for by the people'. "The Faith and Freedom Covenant" (n.p, n.d.)

⁶²⁷ Pamphlet "The Foursquare Gospel Testimony" (London: Elim Publishing Co., n.d.). Although this pamphlet is not dated, there was an article announcing the establishment of the group in the Elim Evangel, 1 October 1927, 292.

group, one had to pay a subscription of 1/6 d. per annum, in return for which the member would receive information of special meetings being held in their area. The new organisation led to the publication of a magazine devoted to this cause.

Entitled the Foursquare Revivalist, it was intended for people who were similar to the

lonely Waldensians [who] isolated in the vast darkness with which Rome had covered Europe [...] wondered if there were still, anywhere in the world, any other spiritual community which still held the pure "faith of the Apostle".⁶²⁸

The magazine was designed to provide,

a sanctuary for fellowship, a forum for testimony and discussion, an arena where the Sword of the Spirit may test the weapons of modern doubt, and a lighthouse which can guide the lost to Port.⁶²⁹

The magazine, edited by Pastor C. A. Coates, was a short-lived publication. Its final issue was in 1929. The demise of the publication marked the end of the Foursquare Gospel Testimony.

2. The World Revival Crusade and Jeffreys

The World Revival Crusade was launched in 1936. According to the report in the Evangel,⁶³⁰ and the pamphlet heralding its launch,⁶³¹ the need for the Crusade became evident after the revival campaigns conducted in Switzerland in 1934 and was confirmed by their experiences in Palestine in 1935. The impetus came from 'working side by side with ... saintly ministers and earnest

⁶²⁸ Editorial: "Why we appear" The Foursquare Revivalist, 3 August 1928, 2.

⁶²⁹ Ibid.

⁶³⁰ "The World Revival Crusade" Elim Evangel, 14 February 1936, 99.

⁶³¹ The World Revival Crusade (London: Elim Publishing Co., n.d.).

Christian workers drawn from the different denominations',⁶³² who were prepared to stand for the fundamental tenets of faith,⁶³³ were willing to pray to the same ends, namely revival, and would be willing to send in their prayer requests to a central venue.⁶³⁴ As such, it was very similar in intention to the Foursquare Gospel Testimony, but would be extended to include international supporters. Membership was open to all who had experienced the 'new birth', and who would 'promise to pray for, labour in and give towards the support of the Crusade', and who were willing to sign the official membership card.⁶³⁵

However, the difference, and with it the perceived threat, to the Elim Movement, was found in the working arrangements of the group. In this new network, George Jeffreys was to be in complete control. A consultative council was to be appointed by him 'in his absolute discretion' to assist and advise 'as he may require'. Any commissioners would be appointed at his will and desire 'on such terms as he thinks fit' and would be removed 'in like manner'.⁶³⁶ The Principal would be paid a salary from the World Revival Crusade 'as may be fixed upon by the commissioners'.⁶³⁷ Considering his overwhelming power over the appointment of commissioners, this financial arrangement was a method by which Jeffreys would be able to determine his own salary. The Executive Council clearly felt that an anomalous situation was developing whereby the founding leader of their work was now also the founding leader of a new and

⁶³² Ibid., 1.

⁶³³ These were accepted as being the beliefs that Bible is the inspired word of God, and Jesus is the Saviour, Healer, Baptiser and Coming King.

⁶³⁴ This centre was Kensington Temple, a Sole Trustee Church, purchased by Jeffreys personally and pastored by Darragh and McWhirter.

⁶³⁵ The World Revival Crusade, 5.

⁶³⁶ Ibid., 6.

⁶³⁷ Ibid., 7.

separate evangelistic movement. They viewed the establishment of the World Revival Crusade as a threat to their own denomination. Jeffreys' view was that since he was attempting to establish a network that was 'undenominational in character ... it could not carry out its main purpose' if it were to be organised under a denominational umbrella.⁶³⁸

There were a number of significant problems associated with the proposed formation of the World Revival Crusade. Apart from the Executive Council's fear, mentioned above, that Jeffreys was on the verge of creating a new denomination, there was the paradox of Jeffreys wanting absolute control of the new group. In light of the fact that he was arguing vehemently for the freedom of local churches to be able to determine their own future, this appears to be an anomaly. The solution to the anomaly may lie in the suggestion that was made in connection with Jeffreys' early attempts to gain control of the spontaneity of the Welsh Revival. Jeffreys fought for freedom when that involved his freedom. However, generally he desired to control the religious groups of which he was a part. He believed that he was in a unique ministry, whereby people needed to be able to focus their attention upon him. According to this philosophy, it was therefore necessary for him to be able to control everything, so as to ensure his standing with the public. It would also be a reasonable assumption that, since he was being thwarted by the Executive Council and could not receive the freedom that he felt was necessary, it was easier for him to start a new movement where the centrality of his own position would be enshrined. A third

⁶³⁸ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 28 January 1937.

issue of significance regards the secrecy of which Phillips accused Jeffreys. One of the charges made by Phillips relating to secrecy in the World Revival Crusade was in the area of finance. He claimed that Jeffreys operated accounts without publishing them publicly. His letter of resignation as a Commissioner outlined his dissatisfaction with the Crusade, one matter of contention being that 'it is several years since I have been shown the accounts of the Crusade'.⁶³⁹ In 1939, Phillips specifically pointed to the lack of financial accountability in the World Revival Crusade as an example of Jeffreys operating his ministry under a cloak of secrecy.⁶⁴⁰

3. The World Revival Crusade and the Executive Council

Initially, the Executive Council seemed amenable to the Crusade. In 1935, Phillips made some suggestions concerning a magazine for the Movement. Jeffreys, in answering, made it clear that he thought that any magazine advertising the work would only be distributed to people who actively asked for information. He attempted to placate any fears about the possible expansion of the World Revival Crusade by saying,

As this kind of booklet will only be given to a few who might ask for them I suggest 500 [to be printed] or even 300 might suffice for they will be in some cupboard for years!⁶⁴¹

Whether he actually envisaged this being the case, however, is difficult to know. It is clear, though, that by early 1937, the issue of the World Revival Crusade had become intertwined with the question regarding British Israel,

⁶³⁹ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 14 March 1940.

⁶⁴⁰ Appendix 1

⁶⁴¹ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 28 August 1935.

Jeffreys' desire to step down from leadership of the Elim denomination and the question of the government of churches.

In order to answer Jeffreys' questions⁶⁴² regarding the reaction of the Executive Council to the possibility of the World Revival Crusade continuing to function and produce a magazine, Phillips called an unofficial Council meeting at which Frederic Phillips and Douglas Gray⁶⁴³ were also present. The result of that meeting was unanimous in expressing its concern regarding the new publication, particularly the possibility that it would propagate British Israel teaching. Phillips communicated to Jeffreys that,

The meeting was unanimous in expressing its great concern in the attitude you are adopting feeling very strongly you are wrong in i) proposing to relinquish the leadership of Elim, ii) organising the World Revival Crusade outside of Elim, iii) publishing an Official Organ for it, and iv) allowing its columns to be used for propagating B.I..⁶⁴⁴

The letter demonstrated how little the Executive Council were aware of the World Revival Crusade. Phillips tabled a series of seven fundamental questions. He wanted to know whether, apart from Kensington and Glasgow, any other churches were involved. He asked whether there were any plans to establish churches in the future. He also asked whether a young people's section would be introduced and whether secretaries would be appointed in local Elim churches; whether any badges or literature would have to be on sale at the 'demonstrations' as a condition before Jeffreys would agree to speak there. He wanted to know whether any pressure would be placed on Elim ministers to join this Movement and most pertinently, whether any Revival

⁶⁴² Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 15 January 1937.

⁶⁴³ Head of Elim Publishing Company and Phillips' brother, and Crusader President respectively.

⁶⁴⁴ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 25 January 1937.

Meetings would be held in connection with the British Israel World Federation.⁶⁴⁵

Jeffreys answered the letter admitting that British Israelism would be taught, but only as one of the various prophetic views. He answered the various points, assuring them that no other churches would be allowed to involve themselves in the Crusade. Whether any further Fellowship Centres would develop, apart from Kensington Temple, he wrote, 'I cannot say how God may lead in this respect in the future'. It was not his intention to appoint secretaries, nor start a young person's work, neither would he place conditions on places at which he would speak in his capacity as the head of Elim. Similarly, he did not intend to influence ministers to leave the Elim Movement, in fact he claimed the contrary was his real desire. Likewise, he would not be working in association with the British Israel World Federation. Evangelistic events would be independent from any other organisation.⁶⁴⁶ It is clear that these answers were framed in a manner that did not lead the Executive Council to feel wholly satisfied that Jeffreys was willing to work with their blessing. From their point of view, Jeffreys was creating a new forum where he could be in the position of centralised control, open to any desires that he might have, ultimately accountable to no-one. After examining the materials relating to the World Revival Crusade this would appear an accurate assessment of Jeffreys' actions.

⁶⁴⁵ Letter, Ibid.

⁶⁴⁶ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 28 January 1937.

The reply from Phillips highlighted the lack of certainty surrounding the possibility of future Fellowship Centres being opened. Phillips foresaw that any Fellowship Centre would soon become a church since people would want to meet more regularly. Since the Fellowship Centre would be open to British Israel teaching, that would eventually cause the Elim church to either split or become completely influenced by British Israelism. He cited the situation in the Hornsey church where members had become violently polarised over the British Israel question and had left a much weakened church.⁶⁴⁷

After reassurances being received in a telephone conversation,⁶⁴⁸ Phillips wrote that he wanted it to be made absolutely clear that Jeffreys would not be at liberty to start a church. He wrote, 'If such a case should arise, the Council would naturally take disciplinary action'.⁶⁴⁹ This stark attempt by the Executive Council to regain some control over the developing situation was clear. How they would intend to discipline Jeffreys was not elucidated but it is significant that Phillips felt sufficiently strongly to use such confrontational language.

However the Council's final position was amenable to the proposals:

If it (the World Revival Crusade) is kept within the limits to which you have agreed, then we will certainly maintain a friendly attitude towards it. We certainly would not oppose it unless we considered that it would harm the Elim work, whose interests, of course, we are bound to protect. We sincerely trust that nothing will ever happen to cause friction between us.⁶⁵⁰

⁶⁴⁷ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 1 February 1937. Phillips wrote about the B.I. meeting that had become a 'thorn in Elim's side', since a couple supporting British Israelism had joined the church. This had been followed by some 'strong anti-B.I.s' joining the church, resulting in the loss of 'a large number of members who were the hotheads on both sides.' Apparently, 'every minister who goes to Hornsey wants to leave within a few months, and it tells on the health of all of them.'

⁶⁴⁸ An unusual departure from the practice of dealing with business by letter.

⁶⁴⁹ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 8 February 1937.

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid.

In the light of all that followed, there is a poignancy about Phillips' desire for the future,

It would be the height of folly if we were to spend our time and energy in attacking one another. Surely when our objects in life are exactly the same and our doctrines likewise, apart from one point on which we differ, it would be a crime for there to be strife between us.⁶⁵¹

As Jeffreys prepared to produce a magazine in order to publicise the Crusade, the Executive Council became very nervous. Their fear was related to the growing crisis that was becoming evident in Elim,

If your magazine comes out next month [July 1937], then I [Phillips] am afraid of what may happen in some of our Churches.⁶⁵²

Phillips requested that Jeffreys wait until after the Conference so that the magazine could be discussed by the ministers. The next day Jeffreys replied, agreeing wholeheartedly to the suggestion of postponing publication until after the Conference. The fact that he was so ready to postpone the publication seems strange so near to the release date. The reason that Jeffreys agreed to wait might be discerned in his comment that the ministers should know about developments and be told why such a magazine was necessary. It is clear that such a discussion would entail another discussion about the rights of individuals and churches to hold to minority views of prophetic interpretation. This is confirmed by the fact that, although Jeffreys had assured Phillips that the magazine was not being produced to propagate any one particular prophetic position,⁶⁵³ minutes of a meeting of the Executive Council indicate that this was exactly their problem with it.⁶⁵⁴ Phillips wrote,

⁶⁵¹ Ibid.

⁶⁵² Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 29 June 1937.

⁶⁵³ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 30 June 1937.

⁶⁵⁴ Jeffreys was not present at this meeting. Present were Boulton, Hathaway, Kingston and Smith. Phillips was ill and so wrote them notes preparing them for the forthcoming Conference. The notes were dated 7 September 1937.

If the new World Revival Crusade Magazine is discussed at the Conference, it is really necessary for the Ministers to be told what it contains. It has a really strong bias towards B.I..⁶⁵⁵

The discussion that was held at the Conference resulted in a suggestion being made that the World Revival Crusade should be established as a new department of the Elim denomination. Hathaway defended the work of the World Revival Crusade by pointing out that the reason it had been brought into existence was so that evangelistic campaigns could be run with a proper organisational basis.⁶⁵⁶ This is significant. Hathaway's primary concern was that Jeffreys should continue his evangelistic work. Phillips' concern was that British Israelism would be propagated by every means within Jeffreys' purview. Phillips was as obsessed by British Israelism as Jeffreys. Eventually the disagreements concerning the World Revival Crusade were overtaken by the contention over church government. Jeffreys continued to work under the auspices of the World Revival Crusade, particularly abroad, and it provided him with the finance for himself and the Revival Party. By ceasing to be paid by Elim, he had the freedom to explore his own concerns relating to prophetic interpretation and church government, knowing that he would still be provided for.

In March 1940, prior to Jeffreys' second resignation, the Crusade was united with the Believers Commonwealth Fellowship and The Pattern became its official magazine. The World Revival Crusade was seen by Phillips as 'having

⁶⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁵⁶ Conference Minutes, 14 September 1937.

done untold damage to the work of God'.⁶⁵⁷ Jeffreys continued to minister under the banner of the World Revival Crusade until his death in 1962.⁶⁵⁸

4. Conclusion

The split was not finally due to the single issue of the World Revival Crusade. However, in the discussions concerning the establishment of this new para-church organisation many of the fears of the Executive Council became evident. They feared that Jeffreys was creating an alternative organisation to the Elim denomination, one that would gradually draw people away from Elim into new churches created as a result of the World Revival Crusade.

Ultimately, it is not exactly clear whether that was Jeffreys' intention. As with so many of the issues, although he denied the fears that the Executive Council felt, he did so in such a way that failed to reassure them. Jeffreys may have established the Crusade because he felt so frustrated by the denominational machinery that had been created around him. It is possible that he envisaged the Crusade as being a new Revival Party, one that he controlled and, to his mind, one that was able to respond quickly to new opportunities. The final intentions and motivations will always remain obscured by the passage of time and future events. However, the discussions revealed more of the breakdown

⁶⁵⁷ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 14 March 1940.

⁶⁵⁸ The issue of The Pattern produced after Jeffreys died invited donations for the World Revival Crusade 'to support Revival and healing Campaigns, Pioneer Evangelism, and other Spiritual Activities'. Gifts were to be sent to Edsor, "Contributions" The Pattern, April 1962, 40. The World Revival Crusade was finally dissolved in 1996. Edsor continued to live in the house bought with World Revival Crusade funds and along with other trustees, administered its affairs. Money was still being sent to the Crusade organisation, even up to 1996, by people who had become Christians through Jeffreys' ministry and who wanted to show their gratitude. The remaining money is being offered to the small church that Edsor has pastored in an attempt to help them to buy a building. Edsor, Interview, op. cit. Currently, the assets of the World Revival Crusade are estimated as being in excess of £160,000.

in relationships, the lack of trust and the manoeuvring for position that took place during the discussions in 1937. These discussions took place alongside concerns about the financial viability of Elim, and the implied criticisms levelled at Phillips by Jeffreys, and vice versa. It is these issues that will now be examined.

4 The Financial Situation, 1936-1937.

In 1935, announcing the following year to be Elim's 'Coming of Age', the Elim Evangel carried an editorial suggesting that all the existing financial commitments should be met so that the 21st year of the Movement's existence would be a Jubilee Year.⁶⁵⁹ In the following week's magazine, Jeffreys explained that the expansion of the Movement was being stifled by the lack of finance, and that the Jubilee Fund was to be launched at the Crystal Palace celebrations on 7 September 1935.⁶⁶⁰ The following months witnessed regular appeals to the Elim Evangel readers for their financial support.⁶⁶¹ Specific attempts to raise finance included the issuing of Jubilee stamps, priced 1d. each. It was intended that these would be attached to letters, with the dual purpose of functioning as an evangelistic tool and a means of raising finance.⁶⁶² Another attempt at fund-raising appealed to each Elim member to contribute £1 during 1936 to the Jubilee Fund.⁶⁶³ By October 1936, 207 churches had sent contributions to the Fund, ranging from 10 shillings (Shanklin, Isle of Wight) to

⁶⁵⁹ Boulton, E. C. W., "Elim's Coming of Age" Elim Evangel 23 August 1935, 538. The reference to the Jubilee Year is found in Leviticus 25. It was the year in which all property would be returned to its original owner and all debts would be cancelled. However, the term 'Jubilee' may have had an appeal other than as a reminder of a Biblical event. Jubilee Day, celebrated in Britain on 6 May 1935, marked the 25th year of King George V's reign. As a result of this, according to Graves & Hodge (317), 'The name "Jubilee" was being given to every novelty of the day, from a new sort of chocolate stick, to the latest baby in the Ape House at the zoo'. It would have seemed apt to apply the term to Elim's own celebrations.

⁶⁶⁰ Editorial, "Jubilee Appeal Fund" Elim Evangel, 30 August 1935, 554.

⁶⁶¹ Corry, P.N.C., "Remember the Jubilee Appeal Fund this Christmas" Elim Evangel 25 December 1935, 825; Phillips, E.J., "Elim Jubilee Fund" 24 January 1936, 59; "Jubilee Stamps" 12 June 1936, 382; Editorial, "A Week of Prayer" 25 September 1936, 618; "Elim Jubilee Fund" 27 November 1936, ii; "A Final Appeal" 25 December 1936, 821.

⁶⁶² The stamps were printed in green ink, with the legend, 'Elim 1915-1936. The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.' This was set against the background of wells and palm trees, reminiscent of the cover of the first Elim Evangels. For a picture of these stamps, see Elim Evangel 12 June 1936, 382.

⁶⁶³ Phillips, E.J. "Elim Jubilee Fund" Elim Evangel 24 January 1936, 382.

£282.15.8 (Graham Street, Birmingham).⁶⁶⁴ After ten months, the 87 churches that had not contributed received a letter from Phillips urging them to do so.⁶⁶⁵ However, by November, the Elim Evangel reported that only 18.4% of the target had been reached.⁶⁶⁶

It was clear that the situation was not being resolved as quickly as had previously been thought possible and the issue was raised at an unofficial Executive Council meeting in March 1937. A number of specific proposals were agreed upon. Loans would be repaid immediately on request. Jeffreys requested that a notice be placed in the Elim Evangel clarifying that it was the Alliance, rather than himself, that was responsible for the debts. Thirdly, since there were insufficient churches able to support married ministers, ministers would only be allowed to marry if they would also agree to become unsalaried ministers. Finally, tithing would be emphasised for a pre-determined period in a selected number of churches. Their financial situation would then be compared with others, where the specific teaching had not been given.⁶⁶⁷ However, the situation continued to deteriorate. Hathaway, the Field Superintendent, in a Ministerial Circular, outlined the situation. In 1936, ministerial payments exceeded ministry receipts by £1345; in the eight months up to 30 June 1937, a deficit of £1417 was being carried. Although he made it clear that their assets exceeded their liabilities by a wide margin, it was obvious

⁶⁶⁴ Figures taken from Phillips' unpublished notes.

⁶⁶⁵ Phillips, Ministerial Circular 13 October 1936.

⁶⁶⁶ Elim Evangel, 27 November 1936, ii. A final appeal was made on Christmas Day, 1936, but without any resultant success. "A Final Appeal" Elim Evangel, 25 December 1936, 821.

⁶⁶⁷ Minutes, Unofficial Executive Council Meeting, 12 March 1937. Present: Jeffreys, Phillips, Boulton, J. Smith, R. G. Tweed, C. Kingston (in the place of J. McWhirter and R. Darragh).

that this situation could not be allowed to continue. He reported that the Executive Council had met and decided that every church would have to make economies and that all the ministers and probationers would receive a reduction of 5% in their pay. Economies would also be made by limiting or curtailing advertising, printing and travelling expenses. The Council wished that 'this letter be treated as absolutely confidential between them and each worker'.⁶⁶⁸

This proposal of a reduction in ministerial salary was only one of the ideas mooted throughout 1937. The Executive Council, with the exception of Phillips who was ill and confined to the Isle of Wight, decided that they should separate 40 of the more successful ministers to whom they would guarantee salaries, whilst the remaining 120 would be put on 'faith lines'.⁶⁶⁹ On hearing of this proposal, Phillips believed that this 'very drastic' policy would come as a severe shock to the Ministers.⁶⁷⁰ He preferred writing to the Ministers and detailing the exact situation in an attempt to increase the offerings. He also believed that such a policy of reducing the number of paid ministers would open the Elim Movement to the introduction of British Israelism, since the Special Resolution would restrict the protection of the 1935 resolution to only these 40 ministers. He felt that Jeffreys would take advantage of such a situation. Phillips' lack of trust in Jeffreys was patently clear. At a time of crisis for the Movement, Phillips presented himself as the defender of the ministers, with Jeffreys as the opportunist, ready to use any situation for his own ends.

⁶⁶⁸ Hathaway, W. G. Ministerial Circular 30 October 1937.

⁶⁶⁹ 'Faith Lines' operated when churches were responsible for the total support of minister.

⁶⁷⁰ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 13 November 1937.

This point of view was not held by all the leaders though. Hathaway replied and implied that Phillips needed to be more aware of the extent of the problem. He pointed out that the Deed Poll of 1934 gave them an obligation not to incur any new debt; that included the payment of existing subsidies. Hathaway also defended Jeffreys' actions, informing Phillips that Jeffreys was only taking £3.5.0 per week from the Crusade funds, with the rest being paid towards the outstanding balance. He also intimated that Jeffreys would bring the Brighton, Glasgow and Kensington Temple churches into the Alliance so that their funds could be used to pay off some of the outstanding balances of the Alliance. Hathaway then outlined the possible schemes proposed to deal with the financial situation.

1. They had already circulated the Ministers about the economies and salary cut. 'The effect of this has been to disturb the wrong men and to bring dissatisfaction among our best workers, who fear that the end has come and that this is the beginning of further cuts which will make the whole position insecure for the future.' An extension of this idea was to offer salaries to just 33 of the Ministers.⁶⁷¹ The rest would remain members of Conference under revised Direct Government rules.
2. A similar scheme to the above had been advanced, but the men on 'faith lines' would not be allowed to vote their own men onto the Executive Council.
3. The forty salaried men would become a separate group within the Foursquare Gospel Churches of the British Isles.
4. A modified form of local church government was proposed whereby all the churches would be asked for an agreed sum.

Hathaway reported that the Executive Council preferred the second scheme.

Passing on a request from Jeffreys, he asked that Phillips would consider selling the College, since at that time it had no students and Jeffreys did not believe that any would be using the college in the near future.⁶⁷² It is significant that at this point, Jeffreys had recognised that the actual administrative power

⁶⁷¹ It transpired that only 33 of the churches were able to support a minister from their own income. Cartwright, (1986), 141.

⁶⁷² Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 19 November 1937.

to affect the situation lay with Phillips. Jeffreys could only suggest a solution.

However, the suggestion was rebuffed and Phillips, replying, urged caution.

Aware that some of the proposals were unconstitutional, he warned the Council that much could be lost by hasty decisions. He counselled,

Remember our debts are not excessive. The balance sheet is good. It would compare favourably with that of the Salvation Army. There is no need of a panic. A reduction in our debts of about £2000 per year would be quite good.⁶⁷³

His suggestions were twofold: firstly, to send probationers to local government churches on 'faith lines' and salary 50 of the senior ministers; secondly, 'the obvious solution is for the Principal to open up six new big churches'.⁶⁷⁴ Whilst Jeffreys had been able to suggest an administrative solution, Phillips passed the responsibility back to Jeffreys, urging him to concentrate on evangelism and establishing churches, so that the problem would be solved.

Hathaway replied with the unanimous decisions of the Executive Council:

1. The balances of 20 of the best churches were to be kept by Headquarters to reduce the debt.
2. The principle of self-supporting churches would be accepted, thus eliminating subsidies.
3. All probationers were to be employed on 'faith lines'.
4. Salaries in the larger churches were to be paid by headquarters, all the others would be paid by the treasurers of local churches so that if the amount was not sufficient the ministers would be motivated to increase the offerings by evangelistic effort.
5. No changes were to be made with regard to any ministerial appointments.⁶⁷⁵

This was communicated to the ministers on the final day of the year. The message to the church members in the Movement was understandably less pessimistic, although no less urgent. In his customary Christmas letter,

⁶⁷³ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 22 November 1937.

⁶⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁷⁵ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 13 December 1937.

published in the Elim Evangel, Jeffreys urged the people to be prepared to accept their own financial obligations. He reminded them of the expansion of the Movement, which had 'necessitated the shouldering of financial responsibilities on the part of some', and the policy pursued hitherto of the burden of new buildings being taken by all the Movement. He reminded them of their past policy whereby,

All who embraced the message were blended into one family, so that when one church building was acquired in one town, it belonged just as much to the other members of the family in another town.⁶⁷⁶

He informed them that new situations had arisen whereby 'each new place must provide their own home and all churches be self-supporting'.⁶⁷⁷ He then explained that the Elim Debt Clearance Fund had been launched.

Jeffreys' own ability to further the cause of the reduction of the debt was hampered by his illness in the opening months of 1938. However, by April, he was able to claim, 'The threatened financial crisis with its apparently inevitable upheaval which brought about my physical breakdown has been miraculously averted'. He renewed his effort to, 'place all churches in Elim on a purely self-supporting basis, thus eliminating the paralysing system of deficits which had obtained for so long'. He explained that at the end of the previous financial year, October 1937, the total debts of the Elim Movement had amounted to £44,000, although the assets were £200,000. He reported that by March 1938, this figure had been reduced to £37,500.⁶⁷⁸ In this article, he also outlined his own financial arrangements, pointing out that he and the Revival Party received

⁶⁷⁶ Jeffreys, G. "A Call to Prayer and Sacrifice". Elim Evangel, 24 December 1937, 817-818.

⁶⁷⁷ Ibid., 818.

⁶⁷⁸ Jeffreys, G. "God Answers Prayer" Elim Evangel 29 April 1938, 267.

no money from the Elim Headquarters, but were supported by the freewill offerings paid to the World Revival Crusade. They had decided that they (five of them) would manage on an allowance of £325.00 for the year, so that the rest of the money could be paid towards 'the extinction of the Elim debt'.

Phillips later claimed that this course of action was never taken. He said that no reduction in allowances was made and, although £600 was paid from the World Revival Crusade into general Elim funds, within a few months this was returned at Jeffreys' request. He suggested that Jeffreys had simply been engaged in propaganda.⁶⁷⁹ The following week, he reported that a single gift of £6,200 had been received.⁶⁸⁰ Jeffreys stated his intention to include a regular update in the Elim Evangel on the Debt Clearance Fund. To that end, he outlined the position by publishing three figures. The first indicated the 'Total Elim debt, October 1937'; the second, 'In answer to prayer we have cleared off'; and the third, 'We are praying that you will be led to help reduce the present debt.'⁶⁸¹

Whilst the officers at Headquarters were pleased that the debt was being reduced, some hesitation was expressed at how the debt fund should be explained. Hathaway wrote to Jeffreys, suggesting that a subheading should be placed in the Elim Evangel's series of articles on the Debt Fund, clarifying that it was 'for liquidating the debts incurred in providing Church buildings for our congregations.' He explained,

⁶⁷⁹ Phillips, E.J. Unpublished notes of a Speech given at the Ministerial Conference, 1939. Regents Theological Archive.

⁶⁸⁰ Jeffreys, G. "God Answers Prayer" Elim Evangel, 6 May 1938, 282.

⁶⁸¹ Jeffreys, G. "God Answers Prayer" Elim Evangel, 13 May 1938, 289.

I think it would be helpful from many standpoints, and would prevent any other interpretation being read into our question of debts. They might think, for instance, that the money has been spent by giving "somebody" a good time. Of course, I do not know who this "somebody" might be.⁶⁸²

Although Hathaway seemed to be implying that the public would, unjustifiably, suspect that money had been used for the benefit of Jeffreys' lifestyle, Jeffreys felt that any further explanation was unnecessary and would only provoke protests asking why manses were bought for ministers whilst churches were still in debt.⁶⁸³ In the past, when people had asked him why the balances from their churches were being used to buy new churches whilst there was an existing debt on their own buildings, he had pointed out that Elim was a 'family', and that the offerings were used 'chiefly to assist the poorer ministers and churches'. He had now come to the belief that, although legally correct, it had been morally wrong to use the surplus offerings for anything other than the reductions of debts on churches.⁶⁸⁴ He invited Phillips to write the next article on the debt for the Evangel, to demonstrate the unity of the Executive Council. However, communicating through Hathaway, Phillips declined because the debt had been acquired by the purchase of housing and buildings and not through assisting the poorer ministers.⁶⁸⁵

Following the Executive Council Meeting in June 1938, Phillips wrote to Jeffreys objecting to the original article Jeffreys had written. In particular, he was annoyed by 'the reference to a threatened financial crisis, the reflection on the previous Executive and on me personally, and the suggestion that the debt

⁶⁸² Letter, Hathaway to Jeffreys, 3 June 1938.

⁶⁸³ Letter, Jeffreys to Hathaway, 7 June 1938.

⁶⁸⁴ Letter, Jeffreys to Hathaway, 14 June 1938.

⁶⁸⁵ Letter, Hathaway to Jeffreys, 15 June 1938.

was partly made up of deficits'.⁶⁸⁶ His feeling was that it looked irresponsible to be a Movement, and more particularly a leader of a Movement, which was accumulating large debts each year, and that if this was the understanding that people had of the situation they would lose confidence in the leadership. He felt that any impression of 'self-condemnation' could be removed by the inclusion of an explanation for the debt. If such an explanation resulted in the reduction of gifts, Phillips felt it would indicate that people had previously been giving under false pretences. In such circumstances, it would be better if the giving did stop.⁶⁸⁷

In reply, Jeffreys wrote a long⁶⁸⁸ summary of the events that had led to the formulation of the Debt Clearance Fund. Assuring Phillips that no blame was intended by the article at all, since any blame would also have to include himself, he apologised for any distress caused. He then outlined the financial situation and the decisions that had been taken by the Executive Council. He believed that subsidies of 'between two and three thousand pounds a year between 1936 and 1937' had contributed to the debt. He then explained at length why he had referred to the present situation as constituting a financial crisis. With Phillips being absent through sickness, he had begun to realise how serious things would be should either of them die unexpectedly. He was also aware that there were churches whose mortgage accounts had not been reduced, although they had been paying their offering into a general fund over a long period of time. Since Jeffreys felt 'crushed beneath a moral and legal

⁶⁸⁶ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 21 June 1938.

⁶⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸⁸ It was 6 A4 closely typed pages.

responsibility to free the Movement of this debt', the Executive had begun to investigate means of reducing the outstanding balance.⁶⁸⁹

Phillips replied that Jeffreys had not proved that there was an actual financial crisis. He pointed out that merely listing the decisions taken by the Executive Council did not, in itself, prove that action had ever been necessary in the first place. He questioned Jeffreys' pessimistic reading of the accounts, pointing out that at 31 October 1936, the debts amounted to £45,731, whereas at 31 October 1937, it was £41,808. Claiming that Jeffreys' fear at the balance was due to his inability to understand accounting, he said,

It is obvious you do not understand the accounts, and I do not blame you for that - your talents and work lie in another direction. But I think you should accept the word of those who do understand them.⁶⁹⁰

This charge of incompetence clearly stung Jeffreys, who in reply made it clear, at length, that the figures he had worked from had been supplied by the accounts department, and that a meeting was clearly needed to determine the exact nature of the financial position.

Due to the impasse, nothing had been printed in the Evangel regarding the financial situation over the summer. The issue had become another contentious matter that had further damaged the relationship between the two men. Hathaway, attempted a reconciliation. He advised that Jeffreys not to 'take an unnecessary burden over it, for I think we can easily settle it when we come together and perhaps, with a number of us present, Mr Phillips may feel a

⁶⁸⁹ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 27 June 1938.

⁶⁹⁰ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 29 June 1938.

little more easy than if the discussion is pursued in correspondence'.⁶⁹¹

Accordingly, the situation was not referred to again until the Executive Council meeting in August where the actual amount owed by Elim was agreed.

Because he was unable to be present, Jeffreys wrote to the Council, acknowledging that he had included the debts on house properties in the total figure, whereas they should have been viewed as investments. He then suggested that the house property should be removed from the figures presented to the public.⁶⁹² This was duly done in the article published in September 1938. The House Property Fund accounted for £4,100 of the original £44,000. At this stage the amount owing was £25,141. Jeffreys also made it clear that the debt had not been incurred through the payment of deficits to churches, but only through the acquisition of property.⁶⁹³ By March 1939, the outstanding balance had been reduced to £18,626.⁶⁹⁴ However, by this time, any financial crisis had been overtaken by the broader crisis surrounding the position of Jeffreys within the Movement itself.

Conclusion: Was there a financial crisis?

Cartwright is adamant that there never was a financial crisis in Elim in 1937-38.⁶⁹⁵ Whilst the balance sheet, outlining the assets and the liabilities, would suggest that to be true, the real issue was the perceived financial crisis, the effect this had on Jeffreys' and Phillips' relationship, and the principle of self-supporting churches. Although not alluded to directly, this final issue could

⁶⁹¹ Letter, Hathaway to Jeffreys, 12 July 1938.

⁶⁹² Letter, Jeffreys to Executive Council, 1 August 1938.

⁶⁹³ Jeffreys, G. "God Answers Prayer", Elim Evangel 2 September 1938, 555.

⁶⁹⁴ Jeffreys, G. "God Answers Prayer", Elim Evangel 24 March 1939, 187.

⁶⁹⁵ Cartwright, (1986), 142.

have caused Phillips concern. There can be no doubt that Phillips believed Jeffreys to be administratively incompetent, and was angered when Jeffreys attempted to involve himself in the administrative affairs, an area in which Phillips felt Jeffreys to be singularly ill-equipped. Therefore, Phillips reacted strongly when he sensed that Jeffreys had publicly questioned the management of the Movement. Moreover, in the context of the growing demand for local government of churches, the emphasis on each church being financially responsible for itself could lead to fractures in the Movement. Jeffreys was aware that the emphasis on Elim being a 'family' had provided the reasoning for the mutual support of churches, and so naturally to emphasise the financial independence of churches would result in a loss of aspects of the 'family' identity in the Movement. Once a church became financially self-supporting, it would be possible for the church to leave the Movement and determine its own theology and ecclesiastical philosophy. Phillips' concern throughout this period was that churches would become isolated, independent units, which would be open to the vagaries of many different types of doctrine, and in particular, British Israelism. The other possible outcome of churches feeling more independent was that they would be able to challenge, and change, the direction of a whole movement, since some of the authority structures would have been weakened.

Therefore, whilst there may not have been an actual financial crisis, there certainly was a crisis that surrounded the finances. As with many of the issues, it was the combination of this crisis with all the other contributory aspects, that

gave it its real significance. The disagreements over the finances fuelled the problems that Phillips and Jeffreys had in their own personal relationship.

5 Church Government and the Split - 1936-1940

Publicly, 1936 was the year that Jeffreys was at the height of his power.⁶⁹⁶ The Elim Movement was 21 years old and Jeffreys had pledged to undertake a Jubilee tour of the churches. On his 47th birthday,⁶⁹⁷ he was presented with an illuminated address on behalf of the Headquarters staff, and ministers of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance.⁶⁹⁸

Beloved Principal,

We, the undersigned, on behalf of the Headquarters staff and ministers of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance, wish to place on record our deep appreciation and heartfelt gratitude to God for the great work he has enabled you to accomplish in the Foundation and Leadership of this Movement from its inception to this, its Coming of Age.

We have attended with joy the great demonstrations He has privileged you to conduct in the Royal Albert Hall, London and some of the largest auditoriums throughout the British Isles, and have viewed with praiseful hearts the ever-growing streams of converts to Christ and the mighty miracles performed through your ministry.

We pray that you may be spared for many years still to continue as Leader of this God-blessed work, should the Lord tarry, and be yet more mightily used in the extension of God's Kingdom.

Great grace and peace be upon you.

However, by December, Jeffreys was viewing his responsibility as leader of the Movement as being too heavy to bear.⁶⁹⁹ He decided that he wanted to withdraw from some of the administrative work, and at the same time withdraw his own nominees from the Executive Council, and so concentrate on his

⁶⁹⁶ 1936 was feted as Elim's 'Coming of Age'. This was marked by mass meetings being held, on Easter Monday and Whit Monday at the Royal Albert Hall, and on September 5 at the Crystal Palace. At this latter gathering, an extended survey of Elim's history was presented. The tribute presented to Jeffreys was given to him on Whit Monday at the Royal Albert Hall. In 1936, there were 209 Elim churches, with 107 workers. This rose to 233 churches and 117 workers in 1937, but then steadily declined to a low point of 215 churches in 1943. The high point of 1937 was not overtaken until 1952 when there were 238 churches. (unpub. statistics, courtesy of Cartwright.)

⁶⁹⁷ 28 February 1936.

⁶⁹⁸ This was in addition to the one presented on behalf of the laity.

⁶⁹⁹ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 9 December 1936. 'The weight of responsibility of the leadership of our work, and the burden is ever on the increase.'

'spiritual calling'.⁷⁰⁰ He anticipated that one immediate result of this action would be to allow others of 'our splendid Ministers to be elected to the Executive'.⁷⁰¹ He continued, 'Nothing will give me greater pleasure than to see the organisation going ahead in the hands of the faithful men who have followed me as I have followed Christ.'⁷⁰² Linked with his desire to extricate himself from the position of authority with the denomination was his desire to see the development of local church government. This was deemed a fundamental threat by the leadership of a centralised Movement. Although the disagreements in the Irish churches had begun a process of discontentment within Jeffreys, of the five external factors involved in the split, it was the contention concerning local government of churches in England that provoked the final discription of the Movement.

1. The background to Jeffreys' developing belief in the local government of churches

Jeffreys' belief that local churches should have control over local affairs did not develop in a vacuum. Jeffreys always claimed that his desire for local church autonomy came after his visit to Stockholm as a visitor/speaker at the European Pentecostal Conference, held from 5-12 June 1939. In 1962 he wrote,

The sum and substance of the reason for my resignation from Elim on 1 December 1939, was the refusal of the majority of my fellow-governors in the Executive Council to move with me towards establishing the sovereignty of the local churches in all E.F.G.A. churches. Earlier that year the great European Pentecostal Conference at Stockholm, and

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid. Following the signing of the Deed Poll, Jeffreys had the responsibility for nominating three members of the Executive Council.

⁷⁰¹ Ibid.

⁷⁰² Ibid.

what I saw of the Swedish Pentecostal work, helped to open my eyes to this vital truth.⁷⁰³

Cartwright followed Jeffreys' own account by commenting on the 'profound effect' that the visit had on Jeffreys, during which time he was 'persuaded that he ought to adopt the Swedish pattern of church government in Britain'.⁷⁰⁴

There can be no doubt that the visit to the Filadelfia church, which, in 1939, was the largest Pentecostal church in the world with over 6,000 members, and speaking at the European Conference, with the King and Queen of Sweden in attendance, would have been awe-inspiring. However, Cartwright underestimates the fact that Jeffreys had already been aware of, and influenced by, the Swedish style of church government from as early as 1923, the occasion of his first visit to Sweden. During September 1923, Jeffreys, together with his brother Stephen and James McWhirter, went to Sweden, Holland and Germany. Jeffreys wrote about the trip in the Elim Evangel, 'In Stockholm we have experienced a great deal that has inspired us to go forward in our own country'.⁷⁰⁵ He took particular care to describe the church in Stockholm. At that time, the church had 2,300 members and four pastors, but what was of particular note was its form of church government. Jeffreys described it thus:

The local assemblies alone are organised. Love is the only tie holding the many assemblies together. This, combined with strict adherence to the plain written word of God, will EVER obviate the necessity for further organisation. From the commencement of the work, complete unity has prevailed. Sweden has been spared the intrusion of the various disciple-gatherers and other shibboleths that are found in other countries.⁷⁰⁶

⁷⁰³ Edsor, A.W. "The Nine Points of Dr Lewi Pethrus" The Pattern, April 1962, 27; Edsor, (1989) 85.

⁷⁰⁴ Cartwright, 157.

⁷⁰⁵ Jeffreys, G. "Pentecostalism in Scandinavia" Elim Evangel October 1923, 214.

⁷⁰⁶ Ibid.

Boulton referred to this visit as being influential in 'cement[ing] the hearts of the Swedish and British brethren in the unbreakable bonds of Christian Fellowship', and reported that Jeffreys had been favourably impressed by what he had seen and heard of the Lord's work in Sweden.⁷⁰⁷

The pastor of the church, Lewi Pethrus, was the dominating force in Swedish Pentecostalism for over 70 years. Indeed, Hocken comments that the scope of his influence within European Pentecostalism was only matched by that of Donald Gee.⁷⁰⁸ Under his leadership, Filadelfia grew from 70 members in 1911, when he accepted the pastorate, to over 6,000 in 1958 when he retired.⁷⁰⁹ According to Pethrus' theology, each local church should be completely autonomous. For him, it was unthinkable that any central decision making body could be permitted to have any authority over an individual local church.⁷¹⁰ In following this practice, he believed he was being true to the New Testament pattern. He believed that gatherings such as the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15) were temporary in nature and 'made no decisions concerning the work and activity of any local church'.⁷¹¹ He held an unshakeable confidence in the abilities of local leaders, which stemmed from his interpretation of the ministry gifts of Ephesians 4:10-16. He taught that when these gifts were allowed to work together in harmony it led to a liberty of the Spirit, in comparison to church organisations which were so 'over-organised that it

⁷⁰⁷ Boulton, 126.

⁷⁰⁸ Hocken, P. "European Pentecostalism" q.v. Burgess, S.M. & G.B. McGee, Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988) 272.

⁷⁰⁹ Bundy, D. "Lewi Pethrus" q.v. Burgess et al., 711.

⁷¹⁰ Lindberg, A. "The Swedish Pentecostal Movement: Some Ideological Features" EPTA Bulletin 6:2, 1987, 40-46.

⁷¹¹ Pethrus, L. The Wind Bloweth Where it Listeth trans. H. Lindblom. (Chicago: Filadelfia Book Co, 1938), 11.

choked the life out of real spiritual enterprises'.⁷¹² Therefore, decisions should not be made solely by the church elders, but by the whole congregation together. According to Pethrus, in Acts 15 the council consisted not only of the apostle and elders but included the entire congregation in Jerusalem.⁷¹³

The church in Filadelfia held a weekly 'assembly meeting' which was strictly limited to members only. Gee described these meetings as 'hallowed times of unique Christian fellowship, when worship, business, 'sharing', discipline and missionary reports often seem to reproduce whole pages out of the New Testament'.⁷¹⁴ That Filadelfia exercised this form of church government and was highly successful would have been very appealing to Jeffreys. Pethrus' own character would also have appealed to, and had a strong influence on, Jeffreys.

Paradoxically, in spite of all the congregational involvement of the churches, Pethrus dominated the whole of Swedish Pentecostalism because of his personal tenacity. Ruthless to the point of being destructive, he could tolerate no competition to his leadership.⁷¹⁵ Bundy's description of Pethrus could be applied just as pertinently to Jeffreys, he was a 'quirky genius ... [and] ... a masterful entrepreneurial leader, who could tolerate no other of similar talents'.⁷¹⁶ A lifelong friend of Jeffreys, Pethrus would have been a constant

⁷¹² Ibid., 99.

⁷¹³ Ibid., 91.

⁷¹⁴ Gee, D. Upon All Flesh (Grand Rapids: Gospel Publishing House, 1935), 16.

⁷¹⁵ Bundy, D. "Lewi Pethrus" q.v. Burgess et al., 711.

⁷¹⁶ Bundy, D. Review of *Guds eld over Sverige Svensk Vachelsehistoria efter 1945*, T. Aronson in Pneuma 15:2, Fall 1993, 224.

encouragement to him to make a stand for the principle of local church autonomy. Brewster, describing Pethrus, said, 'there were times when his great inner strength was shown and he would not move one fraction of an inch if a point of doctrine, unity or spiritual ethics was at stake'.⁷¹⁷

However, it is unfortunate that Jeffreys did not live longer to see Pethrus mellow in his character,⁷¹⁸ and backtrack in his belief in the total autonomy of the local church. In 1969, Pethrus wrote about the need for trans-local oversight of churches,

By crediting the local church with too much authority and by regarding the independent churches as collective management, a position of power has been created that has resulted in much damage. A person separated and equipped for the task within God's kingdom is just as much a biblical organ as the church.⁷¹⁹

Clearly, the experience in 1939 did affect the British representatives. Gee commented favourably on the procedural style of business and appreciated the polity of the Swedish churches, although he felt that this style of leadership could not be transplanted into a different culture.⁷²⁰ However, it is difficult to understand Jeffreys' reactions to events in the Elim churches prior to 1939 if he was not fully persuaded about this form of government until the conference in Stockholm. Whilst his own comments regarding the significance of the visit in

⁷¹⁷ Brewster, P.S. "Lewi Pethrus now with the Lord" Elim Evangel 28 September 1974, 7.
⁷¹⁸ Gee writing a tribute to him, said, 'His many friends have remarked with appreciation how mellow he has become in spirit in recent years.' "Lewi Pethrus - 80 years old" Pentecost June-August 1964, 6. In a less flattering explanation, Hollenweger (Letter to author, 10 November 1997) points out that Pethrus was only a strong congregationalist when he was the pastor of Filadelfia. When he resigned from the church, he began to soften in his approach.

⁷¹⁹ Pethrus, L. Brytningstider-Segertider (Stockholm: Lewi Pethrus Forlag, 1969) 206ff, cited by Lindberg, A. op. cit., 42.

⁷²⁰ Gee, D. "Lewi Pethrus...", 6.

1939 must be taken seriously, it could be argued that this visit was not the turning point for Jeffreys, but the confirmation of a direction that he began to take in 1923. A motive for his claiming 1939 to be the revelatory year could be a desire, albeit possibly subconscious, to give more prominence to his own divine command, which he received in 1937.⁷²¹ As the charismatic leader he would have preferred to claim that the 1939 conference simply confirmed the direction that he had been taking, rather than admitting that he was simply wanting to replicate another church government system.

2. The desire to change his role

The period from 1936 onwards was characterised by Jeffreys' attempts to reform the government of the Movement so that he would be freed from its administration. The actual result of all his suggestions was that each proposal led to the need for further clarification, dismissal by the Executive Council (or more specifically Phillips) due to its impracticability, and problems of heightened lack of trust and suspicion between the two men. Although his final split with the Movement was four years hence, the proposal to stand down in 1936 was the catalyst for all that would follow. That Jeffreys should wish to disengage himself from the leadership of a Movement that he wished to reform radically seems strange. In December 1936, Phillips had obviously closely questioned Jeffreys' motives for resigning. Phillips later reported, 'he assured me he was not feeling the fact that Elim was getting out of his control',⁷²² thus providing an indication of the perceptions of Phillips and the Executive Council

⁷²¹ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 15 February 1937.

⁷²² Circular letter, Phillips to Executive Council, 10 December 1936.

for Jeffreys' actions. There is no adequate explanation for Jeffreys' desire to concentrate on his spiritual leadership role, but since Jeffreys continued to ensure that this did not take place by offering numerous possibilities for administrative reform, the issue can be noted, although not investigated at length. For the Executive Council, this became another example of Jeffreys' lack of clarity in the direction he wished to steer his ministry, and by implication, the Elim Pentecostal Church. In contrast, whilst Jeffreys appeared to be uncertain in developments that should take place in the future, Phillips projected an image of a person who was aware of the major issues facing the denomination and ready to steer the denomination into the future from a position of confidence and stability.

Jeffreys wrote to Phillips on 15 December 1936, stressing that, in offering to resign from the Executive Council, he was not issuing an ultimatum, and that once he resigned from the Executive, he would allow it to be free 'to shape its own policy without suggestions by, interference from, or dictation by me'.⁷²³ He further emphasised that he had no intention of leaving Elim. However, whilst indicating his desire to withdraw from the administration, he then proceeded to outline at length the possibility of dividing the Direct Government churches into two sections, the 'Jubilee Concentration' and the 'Forward Movement Churches'. He believed the division would encourage an expansion of the work which would safeguard the interests of the existing churches, and would encourage them to clear their own debts. The 'Jubilee Concentration' would

⁷²³ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 15 December 1936.

include all the self-supporting churches which were worshipping in Alliance-owned buildings; all the other churches, and any that would subsequently join Elim, would belong to the 'Forward Movement' group. Jeffreys' main reason behind the division of the work was to provide a means of clearing the Movement's debt, since the surplus finance from the 'Jubilee Concentration' would be used to pay the outstanding commitments. Each section would have its own Ministerial Conference, but a common Headquarters Council. Once the debts had been cleared, the situation would revert to the existing, unified one. Jeffreys' position would then become one of being a 'spiritual father to all'.⁷²⁴ Therefore, whilst he indicated his decision to withdraw from overall control of the Movement, he wished to remain in a position of spiritual authority. His analogy of father-child relationship reveals his understanding of his position vis-à-vis the ministers and churches.

Phillips' reply enumerated the many difficulties inherent in the scheme, including the expense of revising the Deed Poll, the danger of division within the work, the difficulty of overseeing two separate works, and the fact that although all the most experienced ministers would be in the 'Jubilee Concentration', the future of the Movement would be in the 'Forward Movement'. However, Phillips' real concern revolved around Jeffreys' proposal to relinquish the leadership of the work. He wrote,

There is not the slightest doubt that it would be a real blow to the work. Whatever explanation you might make, people will always believe that there is something else behind it.⁷²⁵

⁷²⁴

Ibid.

⁷²⁵

Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 30 December 1936. Phillips is obviously referring to the controversy surrounding British Israelism and the establishment of the World Revival Crusade.

He was, though, fully supportive of Jeffreys' intention to withdraw his nominations to the Executive Council, seeing it as 'an encouragement to the Ministerial Conference'.⁷²⁶ His apprehension about Jeffreys' intentions was strengthened after meeting unofficially with the Executive Council in January. Phillips reported that the Council 'felt very strongly that you are wrong in proposing to relinquish the leadership of Elim'. Jeffreys had a 'moral responsibility to stand by it [Elim]', since he had been the architect of the Movement and he was in danger of 'committing a grave wrong in threatening to desert it'.⁷²⁷ It is significant that during this period Jeffreys was presenting solutions to the 'problems' facing Elim, whilst Phillips was far more concerned with the implications of Jeffreys' cessation of leadership. Phillips was concerned about the effect that Jeffreys' withdrawal from leadership would have on the laity within Elim and believed that Jeffreys wanted to step down from leadership simply because he was no longer able to feel in control of the Movement.

By February 1937, Jeffreys made further proposals concerning his relinquishment of the leadership of the Movement. He suggested that the present situation should be maintained until after the Ministerial Conference, but that before the Conference each minister would be sent a letter outlining Jeffreys' reasons for his withdrawal, along with proposals for the future development of the work. He believed that this would be constitutional, and would also prove to be 'a "fleece" ... put out to indicate the Mind of God'.⁷²⁸

⁷²⁶

Ibid.

⁷²⁷

Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 25 January 1937.

⁷²⁸

Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 10 February 1937.

Naturally this would also give Jeffreys ample opportunity to present all that he saw as the weaknesses of the Movement and, by implication, the Executive Council, to the gathered ministerial body.

3. 1937: 'Set Your House in Order'

Jeffreys' strength of feeling concerning the reorganisation of the Movement was increased after he believed that God had 'spoken to me in no uncertain sound, "Set your house in order"'.⁷²⁹ Consequently, he was determined 'not to try to patch up or gloss over anything that will break out in an aggravated form in the future.'⁷³⁰ This appeal to direct revelation was used by Jeffreys to uphold and strengthen the arguments that he had hitherto presented. This divine command was of great significance to Jeffreys and his supporters. For example, Brooks' work contained an extensive section in which Jeffreys described the significance of this revelation to his later actions.⁷³¹ However, it is significant that after Jeffreys had told Phillips about this revelation, Phillips made no reference to it at all in any future correspondence. Whilst the silence may not necessarily indicate disagreement, or disbelief, it does suggest that Phillips was not willing to be swayed by Jeffreys' testimony to the divine command.

In March 1937, Jeffreys attempted to explain clearly why he felt that he had to step down from the leadership. He felt that the necessary liberty, essential for him to remain in a 'God-given revival work', was being denied him; that there

⁷²⁹ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 15 February 1937.

⁷³⁰ Ibid.

⁷³¹ Brooks, 55-59.

was uneasiness and unrest amongst the ministers and the people; and that the developing policy had created an atmosphere of employers and employees between the Executive Council and the ministers. These were the reasons he wished to lay before the ministers to explain his resignation from the leadership. He suggested two possible courses of action, either simply to present the situation as one whereby he had been freed from any administration to concentrate solely on the spiritual development of the Church, or to be elected to the position after being able to outline his views concerning the necessary reform of policies.⁷³²

It was these 'necessary reforms', i.e. individual local church government, and the freedom to propagate British Israelism, which were problematic to the Executive Council.⁷³³ The Executive Council realised that they had reached an ultimatum point, 'i.e. to accept your resignation, or alter our policy on the question of British Israel'.⁷³⁴ They were prepared to take neither decision and felt that the only option was for this question to be placed before the Ministerial Conference, albeit with the acknowledgement that the issue would 'shake their [i.e. the ministers'] faith in Elim and probably split the work'.⁷³⁵ Phillips' letter closed with an appeal to Jeffreys that he should at least meet with the Executive Council to discuss their present difficulties.⁷³⁶

⁷³² Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 1 March 1937.

⁷³³ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 3 March 1937, 'we all know what your "reformed policy" would entail'.

⁷³⁴ Ibid.

⁷³⁵ Ibid.

⁷³⁶ Ibid.

However, the threatened catastrophe that Phillips had predicted was averted, since, by the time of the Ministerial Conference, the only proposal placed before the ministers was the withdrawal of Jeffreys' entitlement of three nominees on the Executive Council. The Conference itself was overtaken by the British Israel question, and since some resolution seemed to have been reached concerning that issue, the question regarding Jeffreys' own position was accordingly believed to have been resolved. The report in the Elim Evangel noted that whilst the Conference had 'commenced with some feelings of anxiety on the part of many of the ministers', any rumours that Jeffreys was leaving Elim to start another church work had been effectively squashed. It commented that,

as far back as March 1937, an absolute understanding was arrived at between the Principal and the Executive Council; the latter earnestly desiring him to remain on as President, but a mutual agreement was made concerning the organisation of the work whereby he would be more free from the business side in order to pursue his spiritual calling in the great and glorious work of soul saving.⁷³⁷

4. The Conference of 1938

The remainder of 1937 and 1938 was dominated by the financial situation in Elim. The situation was exacerbated by the illnesses of both Phillips and Jeffreys⁷³⁸ and by mid 1938, Jeffreys once again began to agitate for the reorganisation of the Movement, and the relinquishment of his leadership role. In August 1938, preparations began for the Ministerial Conference. Jeffreys objected to the fact that agendas had been circulated by Phillips before the Executive Council and Jeffreys himself, had had a chance to examine them.

⁷³⁷ "The Ministerial Conference of 1937" Elim Evangel, 15 October 1937, 667.

⁷³⁸ Ministerial Circular, 1 January 1938, 'The Principal's physical condition is giving us cause for grave concern.'

Jeffreys had previously requested that a proposal be included that would create a 'united Elim',⁷³⁹ but the agenda contained no reference to the proposal at all.⁷⁴⁰ He determined that he would introduce his proposals at the Conference, agendas notwithstanding, and would enlarge his proposals to include the acceptance of lay representation from the churches to form, with the ministers, a governing body of the Elim Church which would challenge the power of the Executive Council.

At the Conference, Jeffreys introduced his plans by referring to the illnesses suffered by himself and Phillips during the year, and highlighted the potential difficulties which would have arisen had either of them died. Surveying the work, he pointed out that the General Conference and the Ministerial Conference had no legislative power, all this power being held by the Executive Council. This Council consisted of nine members elected solely from the Direct Government churches,⁷⁴¹ but contained only four members who were actually elected by the Direct Government conference, the remaining five being at the behest of Jeffreys: his own position and the Secretary-General's were permanent, the remaining three were Jeffreys' own nominations. He felt that it

⁷³⁹ At this time there were 91 ministers in the Ministerial Conference who were eligible to elect the Executive Council. However, there were 91 other workers attached to the Movement and members of a General Conference, e.g. Probationer Ministers, Essex ministers (a group who had previously worked as an independent group and then had joined Elim), ministers salaried by churches as opposed to headquarters, ministers living on 'Faith-lines', local church government ministers, itinerating ministers, missionaries, the members of the Revival Party and 'sisters', none of whom had any voice in the government of the Movement.

⁷⁴⁰ Letter, Jeffreys to Executive Council, 16 August 1938.

⁷⁴¹ Direct Government churches were churches administered, owned and given ministerial support from Elim Headquarters.

was unfair that ninety ministers in the General Conference had no voting rights and therefore no ability to propagate their own vision of the work.

Jeffreys presented his two schemes, the first whereby all qualified Ministers would become part of the Direct Government and the second whereby a new all-inclusive Movement would be created, known as the Elim Church. Both schemes were in fact directed to the same end, that is to create a larger single body which would be identified as the Elim Church. The basic difference between the two schemes was whether the existing Direct Government scheme was to be enlarged, or whether that could be dismantled and all the churches be administered on a new, equal footing. Jeffreys pointed out that for the first scheme to operate successfully depended on the Direct Government ministers being willing to share the rights they already enjoyed with another, equally large, group of ministers. These rights included a share in any gifts given to the Movement, eligibility for the opportunity to propagate their own work in the Elim Evangel, a right to determine the nature of the future training of ministers and the right to change pastorates with those in larger churches. In return, the General Conference ministers would have to commit themselves to be governed by the Executive Council.

According to Jeffreys, if the second scheme were accepted, two problems would be immediately overcome. The Direct Government Conference would not run the risk of being weakened, and the newly enfranchised groups would not be disappointed if they discovered that the Executive Council's interest was

mainly directed to the Direct Government churches because of their existing relationship. Both schemes would include the franchising of the lay representatives. He concluded his vision for the future by appealing to them on the basis of his own position within the Movement. He said,

In formulating these two schemes I have borne in mind the fact that I have been an Apostle to most of you as ministers and also to the people in our churches, and that I am in honour bound to consider the welfare of both ministers and people in the changes that are being proposed for the future of Elim.⁷⁴²

Whilst it may be true that Jeffreys had the welfare of the ministers and churches in mind, it would also have meant that with the inclusion of the hitherto disenfranchised groups into a combined Ministerial conference, Jeffreys' own position would have been strengthened, since the reforms for which he was appealing were already in place in the non-Direct Government churches.

After the discussion of these proposals, 'it was evident that as a result of the statement being read, there was a desire that the Ministerial Conference should have more power'.⁷⁴³ However, by the following day, the tone of the Conference began to change as Phillips pointed out that there were many practical areas over which the Conference could not have authority, i.e. the acceptance of new churches, property deeds, Elim Trust Corporation business and the operation of the Model Trust Deed. The proposal was then changed whereby instead of the Ministerial Conference becoming the governing body, the Executive Council would delegate certain powers which would be mutually decided upon.

⁷⁴² Unpub. statement by Jeffreys to 1938 Conference, Monday 12 September 1938.
⁷⁴³ Conference Minutes, 12 September 1938.

Jeffreys objected to this resolution being voted on, 'and read the Conference an ultimatum, stating that the Conference must introduce a new legislative body with lay representation or else he would have no alternative but to resign in six months' time'. He pointed out that if such a proposal were not introduced, he would 'go to the churches on this issue and tell them why he had resigned'.⁷⁴⁴

During the afternoon, a vote was taken to indicate whether people believed that there was a strong demand for lay representation. Only eight indicated a desire in their churches for it; four of the eight were from Ireland. On Wednesday, Jeffreys presented his own proposal that the Ministerial Conference should include lay representation and become the supreme legislative body. The ballot result was

16 in favour
59 against.
7 abstentions.

On Thursday, he withdrew his proposal that he would resign if lay representation was not introduced. The following five proposals were presented and accepted by the Conference:

1. All members of the Conference would become members of the Elim Trust Corporation.
2. The Conference would be the body of acceptance for any new ministers.
3. Any ministers suspended or dismissed had a right of appeal to the Conference.
4. The Ministerial Conference was to be the arbiter in matters of doctrinal issues.
5. The major policies of the Movement would continue.

During this Conference the power of the charismatic spiritual leader can be seen to have waned. The ministers did not respond to Jeffreys' threat of resignation. It is clear that Jeffreys did not expect this; he had counted on their

⁷⁴⁴ Conference Minutes, 13 September 1938.

support in the past and did not believe that they would allow him to leave the Movement. However, by their voting they chose to stand with Phillips and his declared opposition against lay representation which he believed would cause trouble for the ministers. The battle for the Movement was being won in the debating halls of the Ministerial Conference.

Unsurprisingly, the turmoil concerning the future direction of the Movement continued after the Conference. By November, Jeffreys had suggested that relationships between those on the Executive Council had become so strained that it was imperative that the problems be resolved. He wrote,

There seems to be so much misunderstanding, and possibly, wrong impressions of one another's attitude and mind.⁷⁴⁵

He suggested that if they could meet together 'not as Executive members, but as members of the body of Christ' for a 'real spiritual meeting' they could begin to address their differing viewpoints. This was welcomed by Phillips with the proviso that nothing said at these gatherings would be repeated outside.⁷⁴⁶

5. 1939: Approaching the inevitable

Whilst there is no record of this meeting nor of the immediate outcome, it is clear that the desired clarity of understanding regarding the direction of future policy did not emerge. Following a New Year trip to Ireland by Jeffreys and Phillips together, Jeffreys wrote to Phillips pointing out how embarrassing and difficult he had found the Irish Presbytery meeting which they had attended together. When the Irish ministers asked for lay representation to be

⁷⁴⁵ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 9 November 1938.

⁷⁴⁶ Letter, Phillips to Jeffreys, 11 November 1938.

introduced into the Conference, Phillips explained that this had been rejected in the past because of a fear that erroneous doctrine, specifically British Israelism, would infiltrate the Movement. This led Jeffreys to believe that either, 'my error has to go, or I must go with my error'.⁷⁴⁷ He suggested that he would make it legally impossible for British Israelism to be introduced or taught in any of the Alliance churches, so that there could be no suggestion that he was advocating lay representation to introduce it. He wrote,

I am prepared to take this second best method to get the B.I. controversy out of the way, for it is ever dogging our footsteps, impeding the work of revival, and now hindering laymen from coming on the governing body.⁷⁴⁸

This letter was followed by a meeting between Phillips and Jeffreys, where Phillips suggested that the reason there had been so many problems was solely because Jeffreys had been unwilling to release any of his power. This seemed to have come to Jeffreys as a new revelation, since, he argued, he felt that the only reason people had opposed lay representation was due to the allied problem of British Israelism. He proposed that he would withdraw from the position as President of the Executive Council, and would stand for election on the same basis as any other minister. He would withdraw his nominees, and assured Phillips again that he would make it legally impossible for British Israelism to be introduced. In return, he asked for the introduction of lay representation, and the agreement that the Irish would be allowed their own governing body, albeit still linked to the Elim Alliance.⁷⁴⁹ This was welcomed by

⁷⁴⁷ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 11 January 1939.

⁷⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁴⁹ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 18 January 1939.

the Executive Council,⁷⁵⁰ and at this meeting it was decided that a letter be sent to the ministers to inquire of their positions concerning lay representation.⁷⁵¹

The results of the questionnaire were as follows:

To prepare a scheme for lay representation (of the above - 10 opposed the scheme, 6 were in favour, 29 did not express an opinion)	45
Not to prepare such a scheme	23
Against lay representation, and prepared another plan	3
No replies	<u>15</u>
Total members of Ministerial Conference, apart from the Executive Council	86
Those in favour of deacons' meetings ⁷⁵²	7

Reasons advanced for the introduction of lay representation included:

1. It was unfair to take people's money and refuse to give them some voice in the management of the Movement's affairs.
2. Many splendid individuals had been lost to the Movement, because no real authority had ever been given to the lay men.
3. It had proved possible in Ireland and had led to greater commitment of members.
4. It acted as a safeguard against any party in the Conference gaining enough power to overturn some traditional policy.
5. It would avoid a split between Ireland and England.

Reasons put forward arguing against the scheme included:

1. A minority from Ireland should not dominate the Elim work.
2. Ministerial safeguards would be of no use if power was given to laymen.
3. Laymen have no divine authority to act on a governing body of a Church of Jesus Christ.
4. Lay representation could be introduced to recommend procedures rather than to legislate.

⁷⁵⁰ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 10 February 1939. 'It is now a few days since our Executive meeting and we have had time to consider the pros and cons of the subject under discussion. Let me say that I am more relieved that I have been for a long time to know that we, as an Executive, are united in our endeavour to meet the growing needs of the work and people for a more balanced government in Elim.'

⁷⁵¹ Ministerial Circular, 23 March 1939. Although the majority of the Executive agreed to this plan, the agreement was not unanimous. In a Letter to Hathaway, 17 February 1939, Boulton indicated that he was not going to answer the questionnaire, 'I feel a trap is being laid for us into which I hope we do not walk.'

⁷⁵² The introduction of deacons into local churches was proposed at the same time. Logically if lay representation was to be introduced to govern the whole Movement, it needed to be introduced into the local church.

5. The work was not sufficiently mature for democratic rule.
6. This would be 'the thin edge of the edge' for the introduction of British Israelism.
7. Ministers would be treated with disrespect.
8. Some church officers were difficult in their churches, this 'plan will increase their bumptiousness'.
9. Lay representatives would need full and equal voting powers.
10. They were weary of constitutional changes and rumours, and were consequently losing the blessing of God on the Movement.
11. This would be the first step to local government.
12. Those who wanted to introduce lay representation should be offered churches in Ireland.⁷⁵³

Two significant points arise from this correspondence. Firstly, the reasons presented for not allowing lay representation reveal the ministers' own sense of insecurity in their positions, their belief in clericalism, and the prevalent fear for the future. Perhaps more significantly, of the 86 replies almost one third of the respondents did not express an opinion on the matter. For the majority of pastors, the constant appeals for questionnaires to be completed must have become tiresome. The findings of the survey were clouded by a row that subsequently developed. Jeffreys' request to see the full correspondence was denied by Phillips, much to Jeffreys' indignation,

There is something wrong somewhere if the man who has mainly built up the work by his campaigns and who is President of the Executive, with four votes on the Executive Council, is not allowed to see the correspondence and queries to an official letter that is sent out to the Ministers on behalf of the Executive.⁷⁵⁴

Apparently, Hathaway had implied that Jeffreys had mixed motives in wanting to see the full correspondence.⁷⁵⁵ At this point, Phillips' power was all-embracing. In refusing Jeffreys' request, he emphasised his administrative

⁷⁵³ A summary of correspondence that was presented to the Executive Council Members. The letter is undated but must have been before 23 March 1939 since that was the date of the letter circulated to ministers telling them of the result.

⁷⁵⁴ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 24 April 1939.

⁷⁵⁵ Letter, Jeffreys to Hathaway, 24 April 1939.

hold on the work, and his power to keep Jeffreys away from any real authority.

As Wilson wrote,

The man who knows and formulates the technique of routine administration supersedes the man who holds power by sheer force of personality.⁷⁵⁶

Hathaway, whose correspondence with Jeffreys mainly dealt with non-controversial ministerial affairs and rarely referred to the constitutional crisis directly, did express his own concerns to Jeffreys in August 1939. Whilst Hathaway saw the need for changes in the government of the Movement and desired to see the leadership become less secretive,⁷⁵⁷ he had difficulties with Jeffreys' policy of disregarding the Executive leadership, and his desire to 'impose upon the Movement policies which appear to be neither acceptable to ministers nor to the work'. This, along with his 'continued policy of change', had 'destabilised the Movement and unsettled all the people'. He pleaded with him to stop the constant flow of proposals for change, and to abide by the decisions made at the previous Conference.⁷⁵⁸

In August, Jeffreys had begun to write his own personal circular letters to the ministers. These letters, soon to be countered by Headquarters' own circular letters, became the mode of conflict for the following six years, and whilst the content of the circulars remained strikingly similar, their distribution continued

⁷⁵⁶ Wilson, 45.

⁷⁵⁷ Letter, Jeffreys to Hathaway, 6 August 1939. 'In our personal talks you have told me that you favour a broader organisation, that there should be no secrecy in the Lord's work, that the churches should be considered, and that our present system does not come up to the Scriptural standard. In this, of course, we both agree.' Replying to this letter (Letter, Hathaway to Jeffreys, 29 August 1939) Hathaway said, 'Your summing up of my attitude in paragraph 3 [i.e. the passage quoted] is, I think, correct.'

⁷⁵⁸ Letter, Hathaway to Jeffreys, 29 August 1939.

unabating. Jeffreys appears to have believed that the circulars could have a genuinely positive effect upon the ministers and the Movement. In an early circular he wrote,

This is really the first time we have tackled our difficulties in this circular letter fashion, and I feel sure we shall all benefit by it before coming to the Conference.⁷⁵⁹

The question of whether it was either feasible, or helpful, to hold a Conference at this time became a contentious issue. Whilst life in Britain in 1939 was unsettled with the onset of the war, the internal life of the Movement was tumultuous. Phillips had moved himself, the Evangel, the accounts and the administrative hub from London to Glossop to avoid possibility of war damage.⁷⁶⁰ This move obviously made communication between Phillips and Hathaway, who was left in London overseeing the ministers from Clapham, very difficult. This added strain on the administration of the Movement was a matter of contention between the two men.⁷⁶¹ Phillips suggested that it would be in the best interests of everyone if the Conference, due to meet in September, was adjourned. His desire was that the adjournment should be done quickly, and as far as was possible, secretly. To achieve this, he initially suggested that Hathaway gather eleven ministers, the necessary quorum, to meet and adjourn the Conference. In doing this, it was imperative that Jeffreys should not hear about the meeting, otherwise he could have attended and pushed his own policy decisions through.

⁷⁵⁹ Circular Letter, Jeffreys to ministers, 5 August 1939.

⁷⁶⁰ Elim Evangel, 6 October 1939, 630.

⁷⁶¹ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 16 October 1939. Hathaway urged Phillips to return to London since it was unlikely that any real damage would be sustained, and combined with the cost of being in Glossop and the difficulties of communication he felt the work would be given more help if Phillips returned. Phillips disagreed, 'I think that the real war we expected is only just beginning.' Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 17 October 1939.

Therefore, Phillips advised Hathaway to ensure that the eleven ministers were not sympathetic to Jeffreys.⁷⁶² This plan was dropped when Hathaway highlighted the problem of keeping such a meeting secret when he was only going to invite eleven men out of a possible group of eighteen London ministers.⁷⁶³ Phillips suggested an alternative plan whereby Hathaway would attend with just one other present, and adjourn the meeting for the 21 day period allowed under the Deed Poll.⁷⁶⁴ In October, Hathaway repeated this again, although this time he did it alone:

I attended a meeting of the Ministerial Conference last evening at the Minor Hall, Clapham. I was the first and the last present. I elected myself chairman and declared that the meeting was adjourned to a day and time to be notified later! No one witnessed my feat and I challenge anyone to deny that I was there!⁷⁶⁵

6. The Conference of 1939

6.1 Preparing for the Conference

It became clear that a Conference was imperative. Jeffreys' letters to the ministers continued. Phillips wrote,

I am exceedingly sorry that the Principal is still going on with his letter writing in the present international emergency. It seems as though he is trying to govern the work by correspondence from his own address and totally ignoring the elected representatives of the Ministers.⁷⁶⁶

Phillips was growing weary of Jeffreys' attempts to take every executive decision to the ministers and wrote,

Everything with the Principal is now a major issue. Perhaps he would like to install the 100-odd members of the Conference in a board room full-time waiting to decide points as they arise in the office.⁷⁶⁷

⁷⁶² Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 12 September 1939.

⁷⁶³ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 13 September 1939.

⁷⁶⁴ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 14 September 1939.

⁷⁶⁵ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 10 October 1939.

⁷⁶⁶ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 15 September 1939.

⁷⁶⁷ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 26 September 1939.

Hathaway was of the firm opinion that if a Conference was to be held, many of the issues would be able to be settled. However, after the ministers received their circulation notifying them of the Conference dates, Jeffreys wrote to Phillips expressing his doubts as to the possibility of his attending the Conference. Eventually, he relented and agreed to go to the Conference but made it clear that he would not 'stand for any third degree methods practiced (sic.) on him'.⁷⁶⁸ He subsequently suggested that he would remain at 10, Clarence Road, Clapham, whilst the Conference took place in Woodlands, next door. This meant that he would be able to answer any questions in writing.⁷⁶⁹ Phillips, commenting on Jeffreys' proposals wrote to the Executive Council, 'It is difficult to put into writing all one feels on his remarks for not attending the Conference'. Jeffreys' absence notwithstanding, the need for a Conference had become essential since without one they would 'soon face chaos'.⁷⁷⁰

Phillips wrote to Jeffreys outlining the issues that would be raised at the Conference. In particular, the assertions that Jeffreys had made concerning the absolute power of the Executive Council would be totally discounted and the Conference would be made aware that the system of government that Jeffreys condemned was of his own design. The only change that had been made by the Executive Council to the proposals for the Deed Poll was that instead of Jeffreys' suggestion that he have four nominees on the Council, they recommended he only have three. The scheme that Jeffreys had outlined in

⁷⁶⁸ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 18 October 1939.

⁷⁶⁹ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 26 October 1939.

⁷⁷⁰ Letter, Phillips to the members of the Executive Council (Hathaway, Boulton, J. Smith, P.N. Corry, C. Kingston, S. Gorman) 27 October 1939.

1937 of reducing the Ministerial Conference to 40 ministers on the grounds of financial necessity would be made public, as would his reaction to the fact that the Deed Poll made it unconstitutional. Phillips made it clear that he would charge Jeffreys with creating a situation of unrest and dissatisfaction and argue strenuously that the problems had been totally as a result of Jeffreys' proposed changes. In addition, he would ask 'pointed questions'; namely, why Jeffreys had not carried out his promise to transfer properties held in his own name to the Elim Trust Corporation; why he discouraged any evangelistic campaigns apart from his own; why he continually attempted to inflict his will on the Council and why, in his attempts to make Elim more accountable, he had established the 'one man government' of the World Revival Campaign. The cost and time expended on the wrangling would also be emphasised.⁷⁷¹

The scene was set for the battle at the Conference.

6.2 The Conference: 20 November - 1 December, 1939

It was during this Conference that Phillips began to outline to the ministers the exact gravity of the situation that was facing the Movement. Whilst Jeffreys refused to join the Conference, preferring to make occasional appearances and statements, Phillips began the Conference deliberations by refuting each of Jeffreys' contentious points, as he had promised he would. He then outlined all the changes that Jeffreys had proposed throughout his time as leader of the Movement.⁷⁷² Whilst his stated purpose in this exercise was to help ministers

⁷⁷¹ Copy of letter sent to Jeffreys, enclosed in Letter Phillips to Hathaway, 7 November 1939.

⁷⁷² See Appendix 1 for full text. The following material and all quotes are based on that text.

'get a proper perspective', the underlying aim seems to have been to discredit Jeffreys in the eyes of the ministers so that any further proposed changes would be rejected.

Phillips began by enumerating the various constitutional changes that had been introduced, beginning in 1922 through to the agitation for a new version of the Deed Poll in 1938, pointing out that Jeffreys had introduced a new constitution for the Movement on average every three years. This rate of change was ridiculed, but he augmented the damage to Jeffreys' reputation by presenting information concerning Jeffreys' schemes that had been introduced against the wishes of the Executive Council. For example, Phillips argued that in 1928, Jeffreys had insisted on the Publishing Company buying property, namely 7 Paternoster Row, against the wishes of Henderson, E. J. Phillips, and F. B. Phillips.⁷⁷³ After two years, the Alliance had to withdraw its involvement, being obliged to write off losses of over £1500 to avoid public bankruptcy proceedings. It was at the same time that the Foursquare Revivalist magazine was introduced, although Phillips' brother had 'pleaded with him not to embark on it'. This venture proved to be a 'fiasco'. During the same period, Jeffreys decided that shops should be opened, the first being launched in Brighton. After a few years, he had decided that no shops should be owned, suggesting that even the Publishing Company should close. In 1929, he started various sections in the Movement 'against our will', and yet, since then, had continually demanded concessions to bring the sections together again. In the same year,

⁷⁷³ The manager of the Publishing Company.

he introduced the Divisional Superintendency system. Although it worked 'splendidly until 1934', it was scrapped simply because Jeffreys was desperate to remove one or two of the Superintendents, and believed that the easiest way to accomplish this was to dismantle the whole system.

Phillips also outlined the circumstances surrounding, and caused by, the British Israel arguments. It had been Phillips' initial intention to inform the Conference that Jeffreys' motivation in introducing British Israelism into the Movement was to 'bring crowds of moneyed people into our work', although in his subsequent annotations he deleted this line. Phillips pointed to the amount of time and effort that had been expended on the conflict, arguing that Jeffreys and his desires had been the single obstacle to any further expansion within the churches. He charged Jeffreys with hypocrisy, informing the Conference that whilst Jeffreys had always argued for the importance of 'liberty of conscience', he had been prepared to sacrifice the cause of British Israelism, making it legally impossible to be taught in the churches, in exchange for the introduction of lay representation.⁷⁷⁴ He believed this to be an example of Jeffreys 'selling his conscience for lay representation'. Although Jeffreys had assured the Executive Council in 1934 that he had no intention of introducing British Israelism into the Movement via the introduction of Local Church Government, Phillips had never believed him, and three years later, Jeffreys had admitted to Phillips that the Local Church Government scheme had been introduced precisely with the intention of introducing British Israelism into the churches.

⁷⁷⁴ He quoted from the letter that Jeffreys had sent to him in January 1939.

Phillips then turned his attention to the crisis concerning the Movement's finances in 1937. Although £7,000 had been raised by the Jubilee Fund, some ministers were 'practically starving', whilst mortgages that had been scheduled to be paid over 15 years were settled. The following year had seen the turmoil of the lay representation battles, and the first of many ultimatums given by Jeffreys that he would resign, even if that meant that the work 'was split from top to bottom'. Although at the close of the 1938 Conference Jeffreys had claimed that a resolution had been achieved with a 'real unity of policy', he was still pressing for lay representation as late as 11 July 1939.

This devastating survey of Jeffreys' leadership was summarised by Phillips referring to the 'scores of schemes drawn up by George Jeffreys' and 'the hundreds, if not a thousand letters during past years arguing and setting out all sorts of schemes. This has been going on for at least 10 years'. Jeffreys was not arguing for just one issue; otherwise Phillips suggested that he should be given his demands for the sake of peace, but the sheer number of schemes meant that this was simply impossible. Phillips said, 'The fact is, he is not fighting for a principle, he is fighting for his own way - for every scheme that comes into his head'. The present troubles in Elim were 'entirely caused by George Jeffreys' and were exacerbated because Jeffreys had ceased to consult Headquarters, preferring to refer only to the 'admirers and flatterers' that surrounded him.⁷⁷⁵

⁷⁷⁵ A reference, in particular, to Edsor, Darragh, McWhirter, Leech and their supporters.

Incredibly, after this demolition of Jeffreys' character and abilities, he concluded by appealing for Jeffreys to remain as a leader in a spiritual capacity, since he had failed totally to competently oversee the administration of the work. Phillips argued that Jeffreys' illness and his administrative incompetence completely invalidated any contribution that he could have made. He summarised by using the analogy of King George VI and the government. George Jeffreys was to 'have no more to say in its (Elim's) government than King George VI has to the government of this land'.

This overview of the previous decade was presented on the first day of the Conference. It was a devastating attack on Jeffreys' character and ability. Phillips seems to have included all the accumulated frustration that had simmered during the previous ten years in his relationship with Jeffreys. This speech was the decisive breaking point of Jeffreys' relationship with Elim. Phillips had discredited Jeffreys' schemes; inevitably, any further ideas that Jeffreys presented would be viewed with the utmost suspicion. Although he had been invited to become the spiritual head of the Movement, it was unrealistic to believe that Jeffreys would either accept that role, or alternatively that he would still be able to command the necessary respect.

Jeffreys had refused to attend the Conference, and so the Conference appointed a deputation of four ministers, whose initial task was to impress upon him the necessity of attending the Conference that evening to discuss the points that had been raised. He refused, but directed the Conference to the

eight points raised in his circular letter of November 1939.⁷⁷⁶ The discussion that ensued centred around whether Jeffreys could be elected as a spiritual leader on merit, rather than on policy, as Jeffreys had wished. The Conference decided that they would ask Jeffreys to stand for election as a spiritual head, and Jeffreys, having had this resolution delivered to him, agreed to their request.

The eight points were then discussed and after 'several days, and after much coming and going between the Conference and the Principal and exchange of views between the parties',⁷⁷⁷ the only area of disagreement concerned the Model Trust Deed. The Conference agreed that the Ministerial Conference, not the Executive Council, would become the governing body with the inclusion of accredited lay pastors with five years ministerial experience; a property board would be established to oversee the future purchase and selling of property, this board would include three laymen; lay representation would be introduced if this was approved by two-thirds of the Conference; presbyteries would be established if there was a similar demand; a diaconate would be set up in every church; the Principal would be relieved from his obligation and a Book of Order

⁷⁷⁶

The 8 points were the demands for:

1. The Ministerial Conference to be the governing body of Elim, with the Executive Council being the functioning arm of the Conference.
2. District Presbyteries to include an equal mix of ministers and lay representation.
3. Lay representatives to be included into the Conference.
4. Mortgages to come under the control of the Governing Body, with legal exemption being granted to those who had previously controlled them.
5. A sustentation fund to be established for disabled, widows and orphans; a subsidy fund to be established for poorer churches.
6. A Book of Order to be made available to everyone to show how the Movement was governed.
7. Each church to have control of its property under the Model Trust Deed, and so jointly own the church with the Movement.
8. Each church to have elders and deacons.

⁷⁷⁷

Conference minutes, 1939.

would both be instituted. The Trust Deeds of churches would be executed by the Elim Trust Corporation, but 'no building be sold or mortgaged without the approval of the majority of church members'.⁷⁷⁸ The Ministerial Conference would decide matters of doctrine, not local churches.

Jeffreys had previously announced to the Conference that he had formed a committee consisting of ten ministers to co-operate with him and represent him at the Conference sessions. Regarding the Model Trust Deed, his advisers asked the Conference for time so that Jeffreys would have the opportunity to discuss the matter with lay advisers. At this point the Conference lost its patience with Jeffreys and

Resolved that this Ministerial Conference, having gone to the limit in their attempts to meet the Principal's demands are determined at the expiration of seven days from the date of this resolution to withdraw all the concessions agreed upon and to abide by the Deed Poll of 1934, unless the following conditions are complied with by the Principal during the said 7 days:

1. That he sign an agreement embodying the terms agreed at this Conference.
2. That he limit the number of laymen he consult on these matters to 6.
3. That he undertake not to contend against the Constitution of the Alliance by means of circular letter, printed matter, or organised effort.⁷⁷⁹

Regarding the transfer of property, an issue that would remain contentious for the following five years, they called for Jeffreys to transfer the properties of which he was a trustee into the Elim Trust Corporation within the following three months. Lay representation was dismissed on the grounds that it had been fully dealt with during the previous year's discussions. It also placed on

⁷⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁷⁹ Ibid.

record its disapproval of any member of the Alliance circularising material without the permission of the Executive Council.

Having received this message, Jeffreys attended the Conference in order to tender his resignation from the Alliance and from the Elim Church Incorporated.

On his departure the Conference passed the following resolution,

That this Ministerial Conference of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance on learning of the resignation of its President, Principal George Jeffreys, wishes to place on record its deep and heartfelt gratitude to him under God for his untiring and loyal service to the cause of Christ during the 25 years of his labour as Founder and Leader of the Alliance.

It further resolved,

That this Ministerial Conference records its earnest desire that Principal George Jeffreys should accept forthwith the office as Moderator or spiritual leader of the Alliance, and remain Principal of the Elim Bible College.

In the light of all that had preceded Jeffreys' resignation, it is incredible that they should vote for him to remain as a spiritual leader and as the Principal of the Bible College. There was a sense of unreality in their request. It could be suggested that, having decided to strip their leader of any real authoritative power, they attempted to atone for this by offering him an alternative position, perceived to be a 'safe' position where he would not be able to do any damage, or constitute a threat to the ongoing life of the Movement. In offering him the Principalship of the Bible College, they were actually inviting him to take a *de facto* sinecure, since during the previous 18 months there had been no students attending the College.⁷⁸⁰ Whilst Jeffreys had pleaded for a position as spiritual leader himself at one point, it is very unlikely that what Jeffreys desired

⁷⁸⁰ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 19 November 1937.

and what Elim would be prepared to allow him, would have been at all similar in practice.

Following the resignation, the Conference reconsidered the previous adjustments to the eight requests. They maintained lay representation on the Elim Trust Corporation, establishment of presbyteries, election of diaconates, establishment of a sustentation fund, and the publishing of a Book of Order. The changes to the Deed Poll would be executed and matters of doctrine would be decided by the Ministerial Conference. However, the governing body would not be the Ministerial Conference, and the question of lay representation would not be addressed. The Conference closed after a vote of confidence in the present Executive Council had been passed.

6.3 The aftermath of the 1939 Conference

A report⁷⁸¹ was prepared for circulation to the churches summarising the decisions made at the Conference. Significantly, reference to the decisions regarding Jeffreys' position was only included in the penultimate paragraph of a two page document. It stated that

Principal George Jeffreys, who for some time intimated his desire along these lines, has resigned from the Executive Council, and is thus released from the business side of the work. This will free him more fully for his spiritual ministry in the work of the Lord, which God has so signally blessed in the past.

There was no reference to the struggle that had taken place and the report gave the impression that Jeffreys had only resigned from the Council, not the Movement, at his own insistence, in order to continue his spiritual leadership.

⁷⁸¹ Dated November 1939.

This selective reporting of the events prompted Jeffreys to launch a flood of pamphlets, usually dealing with the same themes, i.e. the need for lay representation in the Conference and local autonomy for local churches. His initial pamphlet explained why he had resigned from the Movement.⁷⁸²

Any attempt that the Executive Council may have made to encourage people to believe that his resignation was a natural progression was dashed by Jeffreys on the first page of the pamphlet. He claimed that his argument with the Elim leadership was not personal; he argued that for many years he had attempted to change the system of church government but the members of the Executive Council and the majority of the Conference, 'regarded my continual efforts to bring about certain reforms as being uncalled for'.⁷⁸³ Therefore, from the outset, Jeffreys made it clear that the resignation was due to a quarrel, not a result of a natural development of his ministry. His resignation had not initially been a desire to concentrate on spiritual development but had occurred as the result of unsuccessful reforms in the Movement's government. Continuing, he criticised the organisation of the Movement, referring to the Executive Council as the governing body not just of the spiritual administration of the Movement, but as they comprised the membership of the Elim Trust Corporation, they thus controlled a 'vast accumulation of Alliance property'.⁷⁸⁴ He alleged that the Deed Poll allowed them to compel any persons who held property in trust to sign it over to the Elim Trust Corporation. He pointed out that seven of his

⁷⁸² Jeffreys, G., Pamphlet, "Why I Resigned from the Elim Movement" Dec. 1939 (printed London: Word & Faxlow Ltd.)

⁷⁸³ "Why I Resigned..." 1.

⁷⁸⁴ Ibid., 1.

eight points had been accepted by the Conference, the final division being over the matter of the Trust Deeds and his intention that each church should have complete control over its own property. Jeffreys explained his desire to meet with a group of laymen as being due to the unnecessarily short time frame he had been compelled to work within. He complained that he had been 'muzzled' by not being allowed to circularise ministers with his points of view by letter. He felt he had been 'rushed into signing away the right to make an effective protest concerning the work'.⁷⁸⁵ He thanked the Conference for their invitation to become the spiritual head, but explained that he had declined it since it was his 'deep conviction that the Movement will not hold together much longer unless the members of the churches are consulted on church procedures'.⁷⁸⁶

Summarising the reasons for his resignation, he confessed that

My one regret is, that from the commencement of the work, I did not establish churches more in keeping with the revealed New Testament pattern, under a more balanced oversight of ministers and qualified lay brethren from the churches.⁷⁸⁷

The Executive replied to this pamphlet with one of their own.⁷⁸⁸ Because Jeffreys was beginning to make known to all the churches that he had resigned, an amplified statement had been appended to the report of the annual Conference. The pamphlet printed by the Executive Council was not for general distribution, but for those who had received a letter from Jeffreys.

Phillips, in a Ministerial Circular,⁷⁸⁹ explained why the report of the Conference

⁷⁸⁵ Ibid., 3.

⁷⁸⁶ Ibid., 4.

⁷⁸⁷ Ibid., 7.

⁷⁸⁸ Pamphlet, "A Reply to the Pamphlet by Principal George Jeffreys, entitled: 'Why I Resigned from the Elim Movement' ". Although these were printed without any names attached, they were mostly the work of Phillips and Hathaway, as can be shown from letters between the two men discussing the suggested contents of the pamphlets.

⁷⁸⁹ Ministerial Circular, Phillips, 20 December 1939.

had mentioned that Jeffreys had only resigned from the Executive Council. He had felt that this wording would make it easier for people to understand if Jeffreys did take up the role of spiritual leader, and 'we are pleased to say that the Principal has stated that he still hopes to be free for spiritual ministry in our Churches'.

In the pamphlet the Council went on the offensive and discredited Jeffreys' previous attempts at constitutional reform. Charting the source of the present crisis to 1934 and the signing of the Deed Poll, where Jeffreys 'deliberately transferred to an Executive Council all the power which until then rested in himself',⁷⁹⁰ the pamphlet began an account of how Jeffreys had consistently threatened to resign if his own policies were not introduced. The British Israel question had been allowed to be debated in Conference against the better judgement of the Council, the result being that 'some who were favourable to B.I. realised that a great mistake had been made in trying to force the matter.'⁷⁹¹ The pamphlet then moved to Jeffreys' attempts to reform church government. It was explained that due to a desire 'to meet the Principal' and his demands 'they [the Executive Council] sanctioned the formation of a Local Government section in Elim'.⁷⁹² The pamphlet highlighted that Jeffreys' campaigning for governmental change had absorbed his energy, which had 'hitherto been put into those glorious campaigns for which the Principal was doubtless called and chosen of God'.⁷⁹³ The Conference in 1938 had seen Jeffreys threatening to

⁷⁹⁰ Pamphlet, "A Reply ...", 1.

⁷⁹¹ Ibid., 2.

⁷⁹² Ibid., 2.

⁷⁹³ Ibid., 2.

resign, but although he had withdrawn from this position, the main period of confrontation had been between the Conferences of 1938 and 1939.

According to the pamphlet, the negotiations at the 1939 Conference broke down for two reasons. Firstly, Jeffreys refused to attend and had to use an intermediary, and secondly, 'although the Principal was asking that certain powers be granted to each local church, (he) was unable to state the extent of those demands'.⁷⁹⁴ Although some demands were accepted, others were denied, such as each church having its own trustees, because it was considered in the best interests of the whole Movement for the Elim Trust Corporation to hold the properties, so that some churches did not invest all their money in elaborate buildings, whilst others had to manage in substandard meeting places. Finally, it was considered simply impractical for each local church to decide the doctrines to be accepted.

These two pamphlets have been dealt with in detail since they indicate the lines behind which each party would take their stand, and from where battle would be engaged. Over time the positions hardened and accusations increased in their intensity, but the essential issues of control and power, whether residing in a centrally governing body or in local churches, remained the central cause of contention.

⁷⁹⁴ Ibid., 3.

7. The final break

7.1 Events prior to the Second Resignation

In a pamphlet entitled The Pattern,⁷⁹⁵ a precursor to the magazine of the same name, Jeffreys outlined his increasingly radical views regarding the status of ministers. He suggested that local churches, not denominational Bible schools, ought to be 'the real training school for the rising generation of overseers that will soon be needed to take charge of the churches',⁷⁹⁶ and that since laity could accomplish all the functions of qualified ministers, the only difference was the amount of time available to them.⁷⁹⁷

The pamphlets issued by Jeffreys were widely distributed amongst the churches and in January 1940, Phillips wrote to the ministers 'not to hold or show a bitter spirit, however strongly they may feel in this matter'.⁷⁹⁸ He counselled the ministers that if any of the pamphlets caused trouble in the churches, the minister should bring together the church officers privately, rather than dealing with the matter in a public church meeting, 'for in such a meeting sentiment will often prevail over hard facts'.⁷⁹⁹ The reference to 'sentiment' indicated the fear that Phillips had regarding the peoples' residual loyalty to Jeffreys. Hathaway wrote to the church officers regarding the concern relating to 'the resignation of the Principal, a crisis we have striven for years to prevent, because of the severe shock such a division would cause to their (church

⁷⁹⁵ Pamphlet, "The Pattern". (Brighton: The Southern Publishing Co., November 1939).

⁷⁹⁶ Ibid., 3.

⁷⁹⁷ Ibid., 4.

⁷⁹⁸ Ministerial Circular, 3 January 1940.

⁷⁹⁹ Ministerial Circular, Phillips, 4 January 1940.

attenders') faith'.⁸⁰⁰ He reminded them that the church is God's work, not man's. Whilst Principal Jeffreys was 'undoubtedly inspired of God in his commencement of the work and in his opening of many churches,' it remained Christ's work, and as such the organisation of the Movement had 'ample justification and indeed precedent in the New Testament'.⁸⁰¹ Without organisation, any real results would be quickly lost. Speaking directly about Jeffreys, he reminded them that no-one was infallible, and criticised Jeffreys, saying,

Nor should any man centralise in himself the lives and destinies of men and women, and by his personality control and dominate them, unless it is to lead them to Christ, who alone is the Life of men.⁸⁰²

However, as has been seen, Jeffreys had become the central personality within Elim partly as a result of his own manoeuvrings, but this had been with the full knowledge and acknowledgement of the Executive Council. By 1940, the blame for this situation was deemed to lie totally with Jeffreys.

Jeffreys continued to publish his pamphlets, and from January 1940 onwards, the first edition of The Pattern magazine appeared. With this was launched the new federation of churches who wanted to follow Jeffreys out of Elim. Initially the name of the fellowship was to be the 'Believers Commonwealth Fellowship', with a philosophy based on an 'open Bible', with freedom on all theological matters other than the Fundamental issues of faith; 'a pattern church', a revealed New Testament pattern for each church; secured property for each church, with each church having its own property deeds; and an 'open

⁸⁰⁰ Circular to Church Officers, Hathaway, 9 January 1940.

⁸⁰¹ Ibid.

⁸⁰² Ibid.

fellowship', which would lead to mutual understanding in church organisation, ministry and finance.⁸⁰³ Any possibility of Jeffreys returning to a spiritual headship role in Elim was dismissed in his statement that the position of 'moderator or spiritual leader would appeal greatly to me if I had no convictions concerning the organisation of Elim to contend with'.⁸⁰⁴

Within Elim, the reactions of local churches to events differed, but there was a fear at Headquarters that the whole work would quickly fragment. It became clear that the demand for lay representation had increased markedly as a result of Jeffreys' circulation to the churches. To an extent, this proved that Jeffreys had been correct in believing that there would be a desire for lay representation if people were aware that it was a possibility. It could only be introduced by a majority of two-thirds of the ministers, but since they were unwilling to allow lay representation to threaten their base of authority, they were unwilling to tell their church officers that it was even a remote possibility. Therefore, they could honestly say that there was no call for any changes at all. It had taken a public argument to provoke the demand. Once people were aware of the possibility, they began to demand it as a right. Therefore, the Executive Council changed their minds about lay representation. It was apparent that there was a real demand, but more significantly, it was safer to introduce it now that Jeffreys was no longer officially involved in Elim. The fear had been that Jeffreys would

⁸⁰³ Jeffreys, G. "A Crying Need" The Pattern, 1:1, January 1940, 1. The magazine had Jeffreys as the editorial superintendent, P.G. Parker as editorial secretary and Leech as treasurer.

⁸⁰⁴ Ibid., 5

use lay representation as a means of introducing British Israelism into the churches. The Executive Council felt that,

if we are able to prevent the work being disrupted and the future of both the ministers and churches being seriously jeopardised, *it is essential* that lay representation be introduced.⁸⁰⁵

This letter was followed by a pamphlet published for public distribution.⁸⁰⁶ This was intended to introduce peace into the Movement, and whilst 'we deeply deplore that the Principal should have upset the work by his resignation at such a time as this', the Executive Council wanted to demonstrate that their differences with Jeffreys were minimal. With the agreement to introduce lay representation they believed that unity had become a real possibility. They replied to each of Jeffreys' previous points,

1. Approval had been given to the concept of an equal number of ministers and laymen being on the governing body. All that was needed was the approval of the Ministerial Conference.
2. It was no problem for all of the Executive positions to be decided by the governing body.
3. District presbyteries had been established.
4. There were an equal number of laity and ministers on the Elim Trust Corporation, although an additional minister had to be included so that a casting vote would be present.
5. The desire for the local churches to have a confirmatory vote on conference issues was a new issue that had been raised by Jeffreys since his resignation. The Council were prepared to allow the Conference to make a decisions on this.
6. Elders and deacons would be introduced.
7. It was agreed in principle that each church property would be jointly controlled by the local church and the governing body by means of a Model Trust deed.

With the publication of these points, there seemed to be a possibility that the relationship might be repaired. Jeffreys met the Headquarters Officers at the Unity Conference, a meeting of all the Pentecostal groups in Great Britain, on

⁸⁰⁵ Letter, Phillips to ministers, 18 January 1940.

⁸⁰⁶ Pamphlet, "A Basis for Unity in Elim. A statement by the Executive Council of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance." (London: Elim Pub Co. January 1940.)

22-25 January 1940. Jeffreys was aware of the prospects for peace, commenting,

It was a touching moment and one that can never be forgotten as one after another from the different movements offered their services as mediators between the two sides of the situation in Elim.⁸⁰⁷

A day of prayer for Elim ministers was held on 6 February at the Bible College, prior to a meeting that had been scheduled for 9-10 February between Jeffreys and the Executive Council. The depth of feeling concerning the serious plight of the Movement, and the fear for the future can be discerned in the interpretation of a message in tongues that was given by Joseph Smith.

Verily those who are becoming the living bread in His hand must be broken; and it is as the bread becomes broken, not by the hand of men, but by the hand of the Lord himself, though rough instruments may be used, yet behind the crushing and breaking are the torn hands of the Bread of Life broken for His people. And beloved wouldst thou not perceive that the Lord is breaking His people: those who are to be the divine feeders of others....

Therefore, be not disappointed, this is not the end, this is but leading to the consummation. The Lord thy God is greater than to allow tragedy to come to that which He has begun.

The Lord is bringing to perfection a great and glorious work.⁸⁰⁸

The meeting on 9-10 February must have seemed to provide the answers to all the prayers offered during the previous months. It was agreed that,

1. The Conference would consist of an equal number of ministers and laymen.
2. The District Presbyteries would have the same proportional representation.
3. Headquarters officers would be voted into office by postal vote.
4. The property board would consist of three ministers and three laymen. A chairman would be elected who would have a casting vote.
5. A Model Trust Deed would be given to each church. There would be quarterly church meetings; elders and deacons would be confirmed/elected every two years; each church would have a representative at Conference; a percentage of offerings, not exceeding 10% would be sent to headquarters; until the debt was cleared 80% of a church's surplus funds would be allocated to the Debt Fund, the rest

⁸⁰⁷ Jeffreys, G. "George Jeffreys comments on the Unity Conference" The Pattern, February 1940, 7.

⁸⁰⁸ Joseph Smith at Elim Bible College, the Woodlands, 6 February 1940. Unpublished transcript, Donald Gee Centre, Mattersey Hall.

would be placed in the Ministerial Subsidy Fund; no church property would be sold without two-thirds of the church members voting for it; the Model Trust Deed would include the Fundamentals; stationing of ministers would only happen after consultation with local church officers; changes in the Model Trust Deed would require the vote of 75% of both the local church and the Conference; any disciplinary actions would be based on Matthew 18:15-17.⁸⁰⁹

At this point it looked as though unity was a real possibility, and notwithstanding the disagreements of the past, relationships would be secured and Jeffreys would continue his work as the figure head of Elim. However, on 17 May 1940, Hathaway wrote a circular letter to the ministers explaining that Jeffreys had just issued a further demand to Elim that all supplementary doctrines should be decided by the local churches. This demand legitimated Phillips' previous fears that Jeffreys would not be content until each church could determine their own doctrinal course. For Hathaway this was evidence of the perennial problem of British Israelism being brought to the surface again, noting,

We are therefore faced with this new situation and these vital doctrinal issues which have been at the root of our troubles are now brought to the fore.⁸¹⁰

Hathaway outlined six reasons why he believed a central governing body was better equipped to determine doctrinal standards:

1. If local churches decided doctrine there was a possibility that local churches could be led into error. Pentecostal denominations were begun as a safeguard simply because many early Pentecostal groups had strayed into erroneous doctrine.
2. Practically all Pentecostal groups decided doctrinal standards centrally.
3. There is no New Testament precedent for local church making these decisions. Acts 15 is an example of a centrally governed Conference.

⁸⁰⁹ Pamphlet, "Unity in Elim" (London: Elim Pub. Co., 10 February 1940.) This material was sent to ministers in a letter ahead of distribution, 16 February 1940. It was reprinted in Elim Evangel 15 March 1940. On 4 April 1940 Hathaway proposed that these recommendations be forwarded to the Conference.

⁸¹⁰ Letter, Hathaway to ministers, 17 May 1940.

4. Young and immature assemblies could be swayed by erroneous doctrines.
5. Therefore, it was better to allow the maturity of a central governing body to determine doctrine.
6. If local churches decided doctrine the inevitable result would be schism.⁸¹¹

7.2 The 1940 Conference, May 20-25: The final break

The Conference, attended by 75 ministers of the Alliance, 75 lay representatives from Alliance Churches, and about 50 other ministers, probationers and church leaders, began its business debating whether supplementary doctrines should be decided by the Governing Body or by local churches. Again, the only notes that have survived are those used by Phillips. He pointed out that the British Israel question had brought Elim into disrepute amongst Christians belonging to all other churches. More significantly, if British Israel was deemed to be a supplementary doctrine whose acceptability was determined by a local church, there could be no assurance that issues such as modernism, evolution and Anglo-Catholicism would not be introduced into Elim churches. He reminded the Conference that early Pentecostalism had been divided by spurious teachings concerning the nature of the Church, 'Bride teaching'; the nature of the resurrection body; universal reconciliation; and apostate teaching of the 'wildest character'.⁸¹² If Elim were to return to a policy of allowing each local church to determine its own doctrine, the only possible outcome would be that Elim would become like Brethrenism, with many different splits and separate sections, or Congregationalism which had been infiltrated with false doctrines. He believed that if the Conference did not

⁸¹¹ Ibid.

⁸¹² Unpublished notes by Phillips presented to Conference.

support the resolution, the 'decay and disruption of the work' would be hastened.

After 'considerable discussion in the course of which many speakers took part',⁸¹³ it was resolved that all issues outside the Fundamentals would be decided by the Governing body, but did allow for 'different interpretations of prophecy in the churches'. The motion was passed with 83 voting in favour, and 72 against.

The Conference then considered the Mutual Recommendations that had been agreed upon in February.⁸¹⁴ The Recommendations were discussed at length. It was during this discussion that Jeffreys was invited by the Conference to return to the Movement in the position of Moderator. He refused to come in

⁸¹³ Conference Minutes, 20 May 1940.

⁸¹⁴ The Mutual Recommendations were:

1. Annual Conference shall consist of an equal number of ministers and laymen.
2. District Presbyteries would similarly have an equal number of ministers and lay representatives.
3. The Executive Council would be elected by a postal vote prior to the Conference.
4. Three ministers and three laymen would be on the Elim Trust Corporation. A chairman with a casting vote would be elected by the board.
5. Each church held by the Elim Trust Corporation would be covered by a Deed Poll of Trust, although any church that preferred could be eligible to have a Model Trust Deed.
 - (1) Church Meetings would be held every 6 months.
 - (2) Each church was to have elders or deacons, or both.
 - (3) The minister and one lay representative from every church to be allowed to attend the Conference.
 - (4) A percentage, not exceeding 10%, of each church's income to be sent to Headquarters.
 - (5) After the minimum salaries have been paid all surplus finance is to be paid into the Debt Fund.
 - (6) Church property is not to be disposed of without the agreement of two thirds of the church and the Property Board.
 - (7) If the church closes, the finance is to be used to the discretion of the Conference.
 - (8) Churches are to be safeguarded for Protestant and Pentecostal work.
 - (9) Fundamentals will be included in the Model Trust Deed.
 - (10) Stationing of ministers will be in consultation with Church.
 - (11) Matthew 18:15-17 is the basis of church discipline.
 - (12) Any proposed alterations to the Model Trust Deed must have the sanction of 75% of the local church membership and 75% of the Conference.

that capacity, but did express a wish to return as an evangelist. When a resolution was put to the Conference that he withdraw his resignation and return, this was passed by 158 votes for, with only ten voting against the proposal. After this vote, Jeffreys agreed to bring the Pattern Fellowship and the World Revival Crusade under the oversight of the Governing Body.

With the Movement appearing to be united with its founder once more, and a new determination to examine the expansion of the work, it might have been assumed that the future was going to witness a resumption of Jeffreys' activities in evangelism and the Elim work moving into a period of renewed strength. However, any such hope soon faded. In The Pattern, August 1940, Jeffreys wrote an article outlining objections from churches who had become aware of the problems that still remained. In his 'attempt to mediate between these Churches and the powers that be in Elim',⁸¹⁵ he raised the recommendations that had been agreed by the Conference and added his own fears about their implementation. Although he claimed that these fears had been brought to his attention, a comparison with his final resignation letter to the Executive Council in November 1940 reveals the similarities between the two lists. It seems unlikely that he would have been swayed by the churches, but more likely that, having encouraged the churches to complain about some of the recommendations, he initially presented them in the role of a mere messenger, but at the time of his resignation claimed the reasons as his own.

⁸¹⁵ Jeffreys, G. "Since the Elim Conference of May 1940" The Pattern, August 1940, 3.

The article in The Pattern examined the following objections:

1. The Conference could become a small body of men with extensive powers since a decision had been taken to limit the numbers being involved. This number would be set at each Conference for the following year.
2. No church or minister was assured of the right of representation at Conference.
3. No church was able to use surplus offerings except under the direction of Conference.
4. If a vote was not taken by the church on the retention of the pastor every two years, then the Stationing Committee could remove a pastor or compel a church to accept one.
5. Churches would be obliged to accept supplementary doctrines decided by the Conference.
6. No provision had been made to accept or dismiss members.
7. The subsidy of smaller churches by the larger ones could continue indefinitely.

The Executive Council replied to this provocative article with a circular sent to the members of the Conference, in which they wrote,

It is perfectly clear that the Principal is now treating the Elim Conference of May 1940 [...] in the same way as he treated the Ministerial Conference and the Executive Council in previous years, and is refusing to accept the decisions of an overwhelming majority.⁸¹⁶

Jeffreys countered this with a reply to the diaconates of all the churches. This direct appeal to the diaconates was a new phase in the argument. Up to this point the arguments were only directly acknowledged amongst ministers and by representatives. Although one can assume that diaconates would have known of the trouble through discussions with their pastors, this was the first letter written by Jeffreys to people other than ministers. Having bypassed the Executive Council, the Conference and the ministers, he was now appealing to what he believed was the bedrock of his support, the ordinary church members.

He said,

I cannot tell how deeply I feel over the circular letter sent out by the Executive Council, a letter which seeks to re-commence a controversy over personalities. Such a letter is uncalled for at any time, but

⁸¹⁶

Circular to Conference Members from Executive Council, 9 August 1940.

especially at a time when our Movement is troubled over organisational problems which must of necessity be attended to, and, when the world is bleeding from its war wounds.⁸¹⁷

In writing to the diaconates, he attempted to show that the Pattern magazine, and the proposed revision of Local Church Government rules could all be encompassed by Elim. He also wanted to explain why he had not signed over the Trust Deeds that he held. This, he claimed, was at the request of churches who had asked for time to be granted to them so that they could examine the drafts of the amended Deed Poll. The Executive Council sent its own letter to the diaconates, pointing out that Jeffreys had gone against his word at the Conference indicating that he would stand by the decisions taken there.⁸¹⁸

Jeffreys, in a final letter to them, summarised the situation as he understood it,

I would say, that the Executive Council is entirely wrong in making it appear that the present dispute in Elim is between myself and themselves or the Conference. The real trouble is between "the powers that be" in Elim on one side, and a substantial section of the Elim Movement on the other side.⁸¹⁹

It was in November that the final break with Elim was made. Jeffreys wrote a letter of resignation from the Elim Church Incorporated on the grounds that nothing had changed in the twelve months since his first resignation. He claimed that the Deed Poll had not been amended; no safeguard had been put in place to ensure that a small Governing Body did not exercise control over the majority of the work; one could not have freedom of expression over the issues of Church Government or church reform without being regarded as an agitator or disturber of the peace; churches were not assured of having a voice

⁸¹⁷ Letter, Jeffreys to Diaconates of each Elim Church, 15 August 1940.

⁸¹⁸ Letter, Executive Council to Diaconates, 23 August 1940.

⁸¹⁹ Letter, Jeffreys to Diaconates, 29 August 1940.

at Conference; churches were not secure in the tenure of the right to accept or disassociate people from membership; ministers were not assured of protection against dismissal or removal to another church; the authority of the central Governing Body was greater than the local church; a church could not reject any supplementary doctrines agreed by the Governing Body; churches could not distribute their own surplus offerings; no diaconate was assured of the power or authority as overseer in a church; no district presbytery was assured of its ability to defend the minister and churches.⁸²⁰

Jeffreys sent a letter to the diaconates confirming his resignation. He referred to the misunderstanding and the suffering he had endured and left the future of the Movement in their hands, stating,

The responsibility of guiding your church aright is now upon your shoulders, and if I am not one with you in policy I am one with you in heart through the old Gospel that has meant so much to us.⁸²¹

8. Conclusion

The final split between Jeffreys and Phillips had happened. After the rumbling of discontent for the previous six years, the Conference in 1939 saw Phillips destroy Jeffreys' credibility. Although there were attempts at reconciliation, it is hard to see that these would have been possible in the light of all the charges made about Jeffreys. For Jeffreys, the argument concerned the divine compulsion he believed he was under to reform an over-centralised Movement, by enabling local churches to have the freedom of self-determination. Phillips believed himself to be the protector of ministers and churches which, if left to

⁸²⁰ Letter, Jeffreys to Executive Council, 12 November 1940.

⁸²¹ Letter, Jeffreys to Diaconates, December 1940.

Jeffreys' designs, would be prey to the dangers of British Israelism. As has been seen, both were prepared to use extreme methods to further their own particular cause. Although Jeffreys had finally severed his official links with Elim, the actual arguments over the issues would continue up to 1946. For Jeffreys the cause had become obsessive and in forming a new denomination he continued the fight unabated. The next year would witness the near demise of Elim and the final marginalisation of Jeffreys from Christian life in Britain.⁸²²

⁸²²

One of Edsor's complaints concerning Cartwright's book is that Cartwright suggested that Jeffreys' influence came to an end after his break with Elim. Edsor, in Open Letter (3-14), stresses that Jeffreys continued his evangelistic crusades both in Britain and abroad, preaching to masses of people. Whilst this is true, I believe that Jeffreys' own actions marginalised him from all the other Pentecostal denominations, so that whilst he had evangelistic success as an individual, he was no longer able to influence the development of British Pentecostalism. It is also accurate to say that the Pattern churches never were as strong numerically as the Elim churches had been under Jeffreys' ministry. A full biography on Jeffreys is necessary so that his life post-1940 can be dealt with in sufficient detail.

Part Two: Summary and Conclusion

The five explicit reasons for the discription of the Elim Pentecostal Church were contentious issues that resulted in waves of disagreement between Phillips and Jeffreys. The deteriorating situation in the Irish churches from 1933 had encouraged Jeffreys to believe that experimentation in church government issues was a possibility. He desired to introduce a measure of self-government into the churches there long before he actively campaigned for a similar policy to be introduced into the English churches. Phillips was adamant that to introduce these changes would exacerbate the unrest in Ireland. In fact, the discontent amongst the Irish churches and ministers would be evident throughout the 1930s.

The role of British Israelism is clearly central in understanding the split between Jeffreys and Phillips. It has been suggested in the thesis that for each man the issue became an obsession. Jeffreys persisted in reintroducing the issue into each Annual Conference in an attempt to influence the ministers to accept the British Israel identification as an optional supplementary belief; Phillips continued to focus on British Israel as the perceived motivation behind many of Jeffreys' proposed reforms. The significance of the issue of British Israelism does not lie in the teaching that was being proposed; in reality, few ministers espoused the belief, Jeffreys did not propagate it widely and the major expansion of Elim had occurred when Jeffreys had been most able to expound his own views. The significance of British Israelism lay in Jeffreys' belief that it represented the freedom for which he believed he was fighting and in Phillips'

belief that to allow official approval for British Israelism would lead to the introduction of other erroneous teaching into the Movement. Phillips believed that all Jeffreys' manoeuvres during this period were due to his desire to introduce British Israel as a credible optional doctrine.

The creation of the World Revival Crusade in 1936 heightened the fear the Executive Council had previously expressed concerning Jeffreys' position within the Movement. The World Revival Crusade was an independent organisation totally dominated by Jeffreys which provided both the opportunities for ministry and his salary. After the creation of this group, it was clear that Jeffreys would never be dependant upon Elim and therefore would be free to develop his ministry externally to Elim. Jeffreys never adequately allayed the fears of the Executive Council, thus ensuring that their relationship deteriorated.

The financial crisis, whilst not a major factor in the discription, was a noteworthy element in Jeffreys' and Phillips' worsening relationship. Phillips reacted negatively to the suggestion that there was a financial crisis within the Movement partly because it reflected badly on him as the chief administrator of the Movement, but also because Jeffreys' solution was for each church to become financially independent. This would have led to them becoming increasingly able to determine their own practice and beliefs.

Finally, the debate over the church government was at the heart of the final discription. It was in the midst of many of these discussions that many of the previous four issues found their focus. Jeffreys, whilst indicating a desire to withdraw from the leadership of the Movement, continued to introduce schemes at a prodigious rate that ensured his continuing influence. Ultimately, Phillips became so frustrated at Jeffreys' perceived manipulation that he presented all the frustration that had built up over the previous decade to the 1939 Ministerial Conference; in so doing, he destroyed Jeffreys' credibility. Although there were subsequent attempts at reconciliation, it was always unlikely that these would be ultimately effective.

The arguments between Phillips and Jeffreys became so fierce by 1939 that it was inevitable that the Movement would fracture. Phillips had taken the moral high ground by portraying Jeffreys as an unprincipled opportunist; Jeffreys had accepted the role of martyr, one destroyed by the bureaucratic church leadership. Although the rupture within the Movement had become inescapable, its survival was not deemed inevitable by anyone. The reasons for the survival of the denomination post-1940 will briefly be investigated in the final section of the thesis.

Part 3: The Aftermath of the Schism

It will be suggested that there were a number of actions that were taken by the leadership of the Elim Church that ensured survival as a denomination. The first and possibly most significant action that was taken was an attempt to make theological sense of the split. For both sides in the argument it was crucial to be able to determine God's role in the discription. Allied to this need for discernment was the need to assure themselves that God was on their side.

1. Making theological sense of the Split.

1.1 The split as divine conflict

The theological understanding behind the split centred on each side crediting the other with accomplishing the work of the devil, whilst believing that their respective positions were vindicated by God. Jeffreys believed that he had been given a divine mandate for the reformation of the Movement in 1937, when he received the command to 'set your house in order'. In his own mind, therefore, Jeffreys believed that he had to be obedient to all that God had told him, whatever the cost. Since he believed that headquarters was embroiled in 'Babylonish control' of churches, he was not able to rest from his fight for the freedom that he envisaged for the churches. For example, in 1958, he offered to make an appeal for funds to clear the debts in Elim, on the understanding that each church would have its own Model Trust Deed.⁸²³ The offer was not accepted. Jeffreys' supporters viewed him as standing for the freedom that had been denied the churches. The opposition from Headquarters was seen to be

⁸²³ Letter, Jeffreys to Elim Executive Council, 21 February 1958.

a satanic onslaught against Jeffreys. This view was held even as late as 1996. Edsor received a letter from Mary Mullen,⁸²⁴ the widow of Jim Mullen, one of the early Pentecostal missionaries in the Congo, that stated, 'I have wept bitterly to see how satanic forces attacked George Jeffreys and his work and co-labourers'. She commended Edsor for his faithfulness to Jeffreys in the light of 'the awful enmity which was levelled at him'. She assured him that 'God is a just God and was glorified in spite of it all'. She believed that those who were guilty of 'jealousy and enmity' in Elim would 'receive judgement and punishment'. That she should feel it necessary to write in such a strong manner, 50 years after the event, is some indicator of the strength of feeling that was engendered by the whole affair.

This was equally the view that Elim had of Jeffreys' work. In 1945, Canty stated bluntly that he believed Jeffreys to be 'doing the devil's own work of scattering'.⁸²⁵ This view had been expressed more officially at the 1941

Ministerial Conference in a formal motion that stated,

We are of the unanimous opinion that the strife and contention that has lately arisen among us has not been engendered by the Spirit of God, but rather by the Adversary, in an endeavour to divert and deflect our attention from the main purpose for which God Himself brought this work into being, i.e. the Foursquare Gospel.⁸²⁶

Whilst they were not direct in naming Jeffreys as accomplishing the Adversary's work, it was clear that they believed they were on God's side; by implication Jeffreys was not.

⁸²⁴ Edsor showed me this letter (dated 23 October 1996) at the time of the Interview, op. cit..

⁸²⁵ Letter, G. Canty to Phillips, 14 November 1945.

⁸²⁶ Minutes Ministerial Conference, September 1941.

1.2 The split as a result of defects in Jeffreys' personality

For some, such as Phillips, Satan had managed to sway Jeffreys through appealing to his own pride. Phillips believed that the central problem lay with Jeffreys' unwillingness to yield to an accountable body and not to step down from power.⁸²⁷ Kennedy confirmed this view in 1983. He suggested that Jeffreys was an insecure man who panicked when he realised that he did not have sufficient power in the Movement.⁸²⁸

For others, including those who had been the closest to Jeffreys, it was assumed that he was simply deluded in his assumption that God had spoken at all. McWhirter pointed out that his major success had been as an evangelist, and that this was the area in which God had particularly gifted him. It was when he directed his efforts to work as a Reformer that problems arose. He wrote, 'When the Revivalist became a reformer of church order he lost his extraordinary power'.⁸²⁹ He pointed to the results of his reformation as evidence of the fact that he had been mistaken, writing,

The bad fruits of his reformism is the evidence that he was not motivated by the Holy Spirit. What he called a vision was only an illusion. His delusion was embodied in Noel Brookes' (sic) [book] "Fighting (sic) for the Faith and Freedom".⁸³⁰

McWhirter appears to have become constricted by the limitations that were imposed upon him as a result of the split. His break from Jeffreys took place after he visited the World Council of Churches' Headquarters in Geneva and was impressed with their openness. For McWhirter it all

⁸²⁷ Letter, Jeffreys to Phillips, 18 January 1939.

⁸²⁸ Interview J.C. Kennedy, op. cit.

⁸²⁹ McWhirter (1983), 85.

⁸³⁰ Letter J. McWhirter to J. Du Plessis, 9 December 1975.

meant a lot of heart-searching as well as a re-thinking of theology. It was worth it. To breathe the fresh air of tolerance, in an escape from stifling intolerance, was exhilarating. To be free from mean, unworthy suspicion was to be free indeed.⁸³¹

This view from one of the members of the Revival Party, emphasising the results of Jeffreys' attempts at reformation was echoed in 1993 by J.T. Bradley.

Reflecting on the split he wrote,

I have seen a Movement brought to the brink of destruction and only saved therefrom by men who adhered to the Word of God. Alas, when men and women get what they feel is a word from the Lord it seems impossible to convince them that they are mistaken.⁸³²

1.3 The split resulting from God's intervention

Another theory that helped people to explain what had happened was the suggestion that God had removed Jeffreys from his position. If some had seen the split as a Satanic onslaught, others saw it as God protecting his church by removing people and shaking the Movement as a whole. In 1941, Joseph Smith⁸³³ wrote that he believed there to be a Biblical parallel to Jeffreys in the story of Solomon who was replaced when he caused division. Solomon had built the Temple, but was removed from his position when the dissension he provoked led to divided worship between Jehovah and other gods. Although messages in tongues and interpretations have always been common in Elim circles, not many have been written down and retained; most were simply heard as part of a worship service. When they have been retained, their perceived significance is obviously highlighted. Of equal interest and possible significance is the general acceptance that any of the gifts of the Spirit contains

⁸³¹ McWhirter, (1983), 12.

⁸³² Letter, J.T. Bradley to author, 12 May 1993.

⁸³³ Letter, J. Smith to Phillips, 11 August 1941.

a mixture of divine inspiration and human desire.⁸³⁴ It is, therefore, possible to read into the interpretations the unexpressed desires of the people at the time. One such message in tongues was given at a day of prayer at Woodlands, on 4 March 1941.⁸³⁵ The message referred to the removal of all that was shaky, to be replaced by that which would be able to stand firm.

Hast thou not noticed that there is a superficial state coming in and the Lord is removing that which is shaking to (sic.) the intent that He might deepen that which was ready to fall away. He is removing that which is fickle, that which is shaking, that He might produce an army of people that will lead others.⁸³⁶

The theme of the message was that Jeffreys (by clear implication) was removed from the work by God because of the lack of stability that he brought to the Movement.

1.4 The impact that Jeffreys' supporters had on the split.

Others took a less dualistic view of events and simply pointed to the fact that the people that surrounded Jeffreys were not wise guides and that Jeffreys had been swayed by the poor advice that had been offered him.⁸³⁷

Because both sides took such stark views of the other's position, it was always clear that there could be no real mediation. The moment that Jeffreys framed his desire to change the Movement in terms of a divine command, the stakes increased. Although, as has been shown, his attempts at change had been

⁸³⁴ cf Gee, D. "Attitudes towards the Supernatural" Pentecost, 38, December 1956, 17. 'If we mean that they (spiritual gifts) involve no mixture of the human and the divine we are manifestly inaccurate. ... Once the basic principle is accepted that a human element accompanies all manifestations in the Body of Christ the road is cleared for a saner definition.'

⁸³⁵ Joseph Smith transcribed the message.

⁸³⁶ The message in tongues was given by W. Bell, and interpreted by Adelaide Henderson at a day of prayer at Woodlands, on 4 March 1941.

⁸³⁷ Unpub. memoirs P.S. Brewster, Archives, Regents Theological College, Nantwich.

fermenting in his mind earlier than 1937, it was his belief that God had spoken to him that meant he could not turn back from necessity of reform. Equally, because Phillips and the ministers in Elim believed that Jeffreys had become a distraction from the work they were engaged in, they had lost the heart for attempts at mediation. Before 1940, Elim had attempted to introduce many of Jeffreys' suggested schemes, albeit somewhat modified on occasions. However, once people began to believe that Jeffreys was doing the work of the enemy, it was impossible for the relationship to be adequately repaired. Setting the argument into the framework of spiritual battle, with each side believing they were completely right, resulted in the inability of either side to give way to the other.

2. The fight for the churches

From the first resignation of Jeffreys in 1939, there were around 40 pamphlets and numerous letters circulated by Jeffreys and Elim, each defending their own positions and attacking the others.⁸³⁸ As has been stated in the previous section, the material in the pamphlets is repetitive, reiterating the positions and charges that had been debated up to the time Jeffreys had left the Movement. For both sides, the pamphlets were weapons in the battle for the loyalty of the churches.

⁸³⁸ The publishing of the pamphlets, under wartime restrictions, was not without its problems. Hathaway and F.B. Phillips had to visit the Director of Paper Control to plead for an increased allowance of paper. Apparently they were not as successful as they would have wished, 'They (the Director of Paper Control) could not smile on the use of paper for religious controversy'. However, the Pattern publications did not have the same restrictions, since their magazine had been formed before the restrictions were introduced. Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 18 March 1942.

Initially, after his first resignation, the advice from Elim Headquarters to the churches was that any discussion of the issues involved ought to be kept separate from the ongoing life of the churches.⁸³⁹ In January 1940, Phillips wrote to the ministers advising that if there were any problematic questions asked within the churches, the church officers should be gathered and the situation explained. The assumption seemed to be that the average church member would show no curiosity about the matter. However, if it was Phillips' desire to keep the matter away from general scrutiny and debate, it was the determined intention of Jeffreys to appeal to as wide a public as he could. In January 1940, he wrote an open letter, "To my dear friends in Elim", explaining that owing to the restrictions on his time as a result of his constant campaigns, he previously had not had the time to reflect on the government of the Movement. He declared that he had come to the conclusion that the churches needed to be established according to a New Testament model, whereby, amongst other changes, church members would be consulted about all matters pertaining to the churches. The campaigning had been,

strenuous work and during those busy years so full of campaigns, which meant much travelling from place to place, there was very little time and strength to spare for the business-side of our work. Suddenly, however, I was brought face to face with problems of organisation and was deeply concerned that our Elim Movement needed to be more conformed to the New Testament.⁸⁴⁰

Throughout 1940, local pastors and church officials wrote to the Executive Council indicating where their allegiance lay. Whilst most approved of the

⁸³⁹ This was the explanation given by the Executive Council for the reason nothing had been included in the Elim Evangel regarding the problems but had been published in pamphlets instead. Pamphlet "Where Elim Stands" (Elim pub.) 23 May 1941.

⁸⁴⁰ Open Letter, Jeffreys, "To my dear friends in Elim", January 1940.

actions of the Executive Council,⁸⁴¹ the fact that the Second World War was intensifying seemed to be the dominating feature for most of the churches and made the denomination's arguments appear trifling. For example, the church at Rugeley encouraged unity between the parties, arguing that if Jeffreys had been inspired by British Israelism for 25 years, it could do little harm to allow him to continue in his beliefs.⁸⁴² On this basis, since his beliefs had not hindered his ministry in the past, they felt that the situation should not have been allowed to develop to such a decisive split. Another letter written by a church secretary, responding to the barrage of pamphlets and letters, gives the starkest picture of how disenchanted the laity had become. Because of its poignancy it has been reproduced in full.

To Principal George Jeffreys, his advisors and the Elim Executive Council

The Pastor and Deacons of Wynne Road Pentecostal-Baptist Church, Brixton SW9 have considered carefully:-

1. The letter of Mr P.G. Parker of 27 July.
2. The letter of the Executive Council of 9th August.
3. Principal Jeffreys' letter of 15th August.
4. The letter of the Executive Council of 24th August.
5. The letter from Principal Jeffreys of 19th August.
6. The Pattern articles.

And as we considered them the Air Raid Siren sounded for the most devastating Air Raid on London of the war. Guns roared, Aeroplanes zoomed, bombs were dropping, 286 souls passed into eternity that day (official figures) and over 1200 people were seriously injured. Of the wrecked homes we are not given details but we are not ignorant of the possibilities.

Christian Brethren! We protest, with all righteous indignation that at such a time as this we should be badgered into consideration of the letters thrust upon us.

⁸⁴¹ On 28-29 November 1940, Jeffreys held a conference in Nottingham for ministers who had been 'previously sympathetic to the Pattern and had corresponded privately'. The ministers were listed by name; there were 42 present, including Jeffreys. Pamphlet "Report of Nottingham Conference" P.G. Parker (Crystal Pub., n.d.)

⁸⁴² Letter from Church leaders in Rugeley to Executive Council, 19 August 1940.

The voluminous correspondence, consisting of legal manoeuvres and hair splitting items, whatever the merits of either side reveals a deep root of bitterness which ill assorts with the protestations of Christian Greetings sent to the Churches with it.

We, therefore, make the following urgent representations to both sides in the spirit of brotherly advice:-

1. Let an armistice be declared for the duration of the war.
2. If the Deed Poll must be altered, let it be so altered as to omit, for the present, disputed items.
3. If subsequently a further version of the deed poll is necessary the expense is worthwhile to secure peace now.
4. The time thus saved will under God be a great healing factor and we trust remove the bitterness and permit amicable solutions to the difficulties after the war.
5. We feel that we express the desire of all Elim Churches in this matter and ask you to publish this letter in both the Evangel and The Pattern.

Yours in the Master's Service

Reg Niles
Church Secretary.⁸⁴³

That the letter was published in neither magazine and in the light of the fact that its contents were not heeded suggests that the reality of the War had passed Phillips and Jeffreys by, each taken up by their own concerns, both viewing them as of far greater consequence than the international conflict through which they were living.

An indication of this was presented in Jeffreys' second resignation letter in November 1940, where appeals to the ministers to follow him in his quest for freedom for the churches. He wrote,

Our brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and others, are giving their lives to safeguard the liberty and freedom of our beloved country. Why should we not sacrifice anything to give our ministers and Churches the liberty and freedom that is theirs according to the Scriptures?⁸⁴⁴

⁸⁴³ The letter was dated 12 September 1940.

⁸⁴⁴ Letter, Jeffreys to Executive Council, 12 November 1940.

It did not occur to Jeffreys that to use this analogy was inappropriate. For Jeffreys the argument concerned the power-base of a small Christian sect; losing the argument led to him having to resign from the Movement. For those 'brave soldiers, sailors, airmen' their fight was for a far more fundamental freedom; losing their War could mean them losing their lives.

3. The disciplining of ministers

Between November 1940 and December 1941, 25 of the 161 Elim ministers left the Movement to join Jeffreys.⁸⁴⁵ Although the actual numbers of ministers leaving the Movement was small, though not inconsiderable, Elim Headquarters struggled to retain the property and congregations of churches that ministers left. At the beginning of 1941, the Executive Council had indicated that those ministers who had supported the Bible Pattern Fellowship would be confronted so that 'the disloyalty of certain brethren [would not] go unchallenged'.⁸⁴⁶ For ministers who indicated any sympathy for the Pattern Fellowship's principles, there was a need to clarify their position with the Executive Council. Hathaway wrote to ministers to inform them that it had been decided that it was inadvisable for 'the disloyalty of certain brethren to go unchallenged'.⁸⁴⁷ At the same time, a need for temperance was also urged since not all whose name appeared in The Pattern had formally agreed with their principles.⁸⁴⁸ Since 'the rebels' seemed to have 'an answer for every

⁸⁴⁵ Each year ministers were free to elect onto the Executive Council any of the ministers. To that end a full list of ministers was published each year. The number was deduced by comparing the list on 22 November 1940 and the one on 31 December 1941.

⁸⁴⁶ Ministerial Circular, Hathaway, 30 January 1941.

⁸⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁴⁸ Ministerial Circular, Hathaway, 3 January 1941.

circular and a denial for every fact' and would not listen to 'appeals to reason, truth and justice', the Executive Council, pressured by ministers to end 'the time for silence' had 'already decided upon certain lines of action'.⁸⁴⁹ In March 1941, Hathaway prepared a standard letter that could be despatched immediately to any minister who defected to the Pattern Fellowship. The letter indicated that in the circumstances of a minister being in fellowship with other groups outside Elim, there would be no renewal of credentials and they would be no longer regarded as a member of the Elim Church Incorporated. Some of the ministers resigned immediately after they had aligned themselves with the Pattern Fellowship.⁸⁵⁰ However, others such as L. Morris, G.I. Francis and E.O. Steward were all dismissed by the Conference after charges of breaking their solemn promises to Elim, provoking dissension and joining an organisation that worked actively against the Alliance were proven.⁸⁵¹ At that time, the winter of 1940-41, Britain was beleaguered, fearing an imminent potential invasion by Germany. Posters were placed prominently warning people to take care lest secrets were passed to enemy agents.⁸⁵² The similarities between the fear of the potential enemy in the midst of the nation and the fear in the Elim denomination at the same time are astounding.

4. Retaining property by force

One of the difficulties that Elim faced was the possibility of a church and minister ceding from the Movement and retaining their building for their own

⁸⁴⁹ Ministerial Circular, Hathaway, 14 March 1941.

⁸⁵⁰ The following all resigned in 1941: R. Tweed, W. Barton, J. Kelsall, H. Strange, W. Chandler, N. Brookes, R.E. Darragh, J. McWhirter, A.W. Edsor.

⁸⁵¹ Conference Minutes 8 September 1941.

⁸⁵² For example, 'Walls have ears', 'Careless lives cost lies', 'Keep mum'.

use. Since most of the church buildings were held in trust by Elim Headquarters, even if the church left the Movement, the building was still owned by Elim. This course of action was defended by Elim since it would ensure continuity of witness in towns, whatever happened to the congregations. However, in some cases when churches and ministers were leaving, the struggle over property rights became acute. One case in particular became a *cause celebre*. In June 1940, the deacons of the Portsmouth Elim Church decided that they would no longer send their surplus funds to Headquarters, but would use them for their local needs.⁸⁵³ The church leaders followed this by demanding their own Title Deeds to the building. Since the Executive Council refused to grant this request, the church declared that they would leave the Movement. Accordingly, on 11 November 1941, the church's funds were 'frozen' by Headquarters. Because the church was legally owned by the Elim Trust Corporation and the church meeting in the building was no longer an Elim church,⁸⁵⁴ Headquarters was entitled, indeed obliged, to take possession of the building.⁸⁵⁵ This process took place on Sunday 7 December 1941.⁸⁵⁶

The process began when Phillips called Pastor Gerald Ladlow, ministering in Hendon, to become the minister of the Portsmouth church. Joseph Smith, a

⁸⁵³ Pamphlet "A Church Congregation forced to the Road in War" , n.p., n.d. (Pattern publication).

⁸⁵⁴ Churches that left Elim began to call themselves 'Elim Free Churches'. Ladlow, G.L. Unpub. ms. 31 January 1983.

⁸⁵⁵ Minutes The Representative Conference, 1-5 September 1941 passed the following resolution: "That this Conference considers it is not contrary to the scriptures for trustees to take legal proceedings where necessary to protect the interests of charities, and it approves of the executive Council taking such proceedings at its discretion in order (1) to enforce the relinquishing by Mr. George Jeffreys of the trusteeship of Elim properties, and (2) to prevent certain Elim Church buildings being used for purposes other than those of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance."

⁸⁵⁶ This was the day Pearl Harbour was bombed.

previous minister, was to induct him into the position on the same day as the 'Elim Free Church', together with their minister, Robert Mercer, were evicted from their building. Five ministers and a detective⁸⁵⁷ arrived from London on the Sunday morning, including Phillips, Hathaway, Smith, Ladlow and Way;⁸⁵⁸ two waited by the church doors whilst the other three went into the vestry. Mercer, unaware of the plan, was surprised to meet Hathaway and Phillips at the door, but talked to them as he waited for P.G. Parker to arrive to preach.⁸⁵⁹ Details differ as to the exact course of events; the Pattern pamphlet claimed that Joseph Smith entered the pulpit and declared that the church building was the property of the E.F.G.A. and that their new pastor was in charge from that time on. According to Ladlow, when Mercer saw the three ministers coming through the vestry doors, he ran down the church aisle and shouted, 'These men have come to disturb our worship, follow me'.⁸⁶⁰ The majority of the congregation, around 130 people, retreated to the minor hall, leaving approximately 25 people to worship with the ministers from London. Incredibly, services were held simultaneously in both rooms, both groups celebrating communion. The congregation led by Mercer met in a local Methodist hall for the evening service.⁸⁶¹

⁸⁵⁷ According to Ladlow he was included in the party lest there was trouble.

⁸⁵⁸ Way was a former pastor of the church.

⁸⁵⁹ Pamphlet "A Church Congregation forced to the Road in War", n.p., n.d. (Pattern publication).

⁸⁶⁰ Ladlow, op.cit.

⁸⁶¹ Pamphlet "Elim and Portsmouth" (Elim publication, n.p., n.d.). The Elim congregation were eventually forced out of the Portsmouth building when it was hit by a bomb in 1943. Hathaway wrote to Phillips, 'Mr Mercer was here and gleefully taunted, "You see it comes home to you. Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."' 19 August 1943.

This incident allowed Jeffreys to declare himself confirmed in his view that churches needed to be protected from the 'secret priestly dictatorial system'⁸⁶² that Elim Headquarters operated, since no church could be certain that they were safe from unwanted interference and possible eviction.⁸⁶³ However, the action that Elim took was also an indication that it was not content to respond passively to Jeffreys' actions.⁸⁶⁴ If necessary, they were willing to take aggressive action to maintain the property of the Movement. In doing so they were directly challenging Jeffreys. They announced that

the root of the whole problem is that Elim has dared to take its stand for true scriptural procedure and practice, and not be under the domination of any personality, save the power of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.⁸⁶⁵

In spite of this, Phillips was aware that if Elim relied on the legal processes, their own constituency could become alienated by the use of 'worldly' weapons, something that Jeffreys would capitalise on.⁸⁶⁶

5. Attempts to appeal to the Pattern ministers

In addition to the pamphlets, ministerial discipline and active reclamation of churches, Elim also attempted to attract Pattern ministers back into the Elim denomination through more subtle means. Phillips and Hathaway read The Pattern regularly, so that they could be aware of the best way of attacking Jeffreys' philosophy.⁸⁶⁷ In March 1942, Phillips alerted Hathaway to the fact

⁸⁶² Pamphlet "A Church Congregation forced to the Road in War" (Pattern publication, n.p., n.d).

⁸⁶³ Circular Letter, Jeffreys to Diaconates "Elim Church Property" 12 June 1942.

⁸⁶⁴ Letter Phillips wrote to Hathaway advising him, 'If Matthews is loyal to the work, I think he should be advised to speak to the Church on the present dispute between Elim and the 'Pattern'. The other side bring as much pressure as possible to bear on the churches. Why not we?' Phillips to Hathaway, 1 March 1941.

⁸⁶⁵ Pamphlet "The Rights of the Local Church: George Jeffreys' eight points analysed. What saith the Scriptures?" (London: Elim Pub., n.d.) 4.

⁸⁶⁶ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 5 January 1942.

⁸⁶⁷ They were probably the only two on the Executive Council who did so, cf. Letter,

that there had recently been two articles attacking British Israelism, written by Gee and Burton, published in the Redemption Tidings. Phillips had requested that 22 copies of these articles be sent to the Pattern ministers, 'in plain envelope or wrapper so as not to advertise the fact that they came from No. 22'.⁸⁶⁸ Phillips recognised that they needed to stay in touch with the churches as well as the ministers, so that if they did experience any dissatisfaction, their immediate impulse would be to return to Elim.

If there is any dissatisfaction with the 'Pattern', we might try to win them back to E.F.G.A., or, failing that, to E.C.I., rather than let them drift into A.O.G.. But to do this we would have to keep up contacts with the churches, which should not prove difficult.⁸⁶⁹

This proactive action was best seen in relation to the public meetings that were held. The Easter celebrations had always been a major attraction to the Press, who had regularly reported on the services.⁸⁷⁰ In 1942, the Easter services at the Royal Albert Hall raised the obvious question regarding whether they should invite the Press to attend, in the light of Jeffreys' absence.⁸⁷¹ The situation was exacerbated in that Jeffreys was holding alternative meetings in the Westminster Central Hall. Hathaway's fear was that journalists would attend both services and compare them.⁸⁷² The unspoken fear was clear. Without Jeffreys, Hathaway felt that Elim's meetings would appear to be a pale imitation of those held in previous years. Phillips agreed,

Phillips to Hathaway, 25 February 1943. 'I doubt whether any member of the Council sees the 'Pattern' except you and me.'

⁸⁶⁸ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 16 March 1942. '22' is an inaccurate reference. There was no number 22 Clarence Avenue, Clapham. The Elim Headquarters Office was at 20, the College was at 30, George lived in 8 and 10.

⁸⁶⁹ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 28 September 1943.

⁸⁷⁰ Edsor, (1989), 49-56.

⁸⁷¹ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 11 March 1942.

⁸⁷² Ibid.

From the Press point of view the meetings would be a "flop". Their main interest was always healings and baptisms.⁸⁷³

The Press did not report either of the services. In 1942, their attention was directed elsewhere. From that point on, Elim decided to counter Jeffreys' attraction by providing alternative services for their own people. Therefore, in June, after Phillips read that Jeffreys was holding special meetings during the August Bank holiday, he suggested that Elim ought 'to hold special meetings in our own halls'.⁸⁷⁴ In December 1942, Joseph Smith was sent to hold services in Ireland, to counter the attraction of Robert Tweed. The idea was not that Smith would air the disagreements in public, but would simply prevent Elim people from hearing Tweed by appealing to their sense of duty and commitment to their own fellowship.⁸⁷⁵

6. Attempts to re-evaluate Jeffreys' contribution

Jeffreys had dominated Elim ever since its birth in 1915. In the arguments regarding reform, Jeffreys appealed to the moral right that he, as its founder, should have to modify the Movement as he felt was suitable.⁸⁷⁶ If Elim were to move away from Jeffreys' dominating shadow, his previous contribution needed to be re-evaluated. This was one of the intentions behind the production of the pamphlets.

⁸⁷³ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 12 March 1942.

⁸⁷⁴ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 21 June 1942.

⁸⁷⁵ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 28 November 1942.

⁸⁷⁶ Jeffreys, G., "Since the Elim Conference of May 1940" The Pattern, August 1940, 3. Jeffreys explained that his role as 'the one chiefly responsible under God for the creation of the Alliance', impressed upon him the need for creating a state of unity.

In writing the pamphlets, Headquarters attempted to ensure that the general public distanced themselves from Jeffreys. It is clear that church leaders were often undecided in their initial reaction to the events. Many allowed Jeffreys to attend church meetings so that he could outline his position and gave people the chance to respond publicly. Phillips and Hathaway were very aware of the possible impact of his charismatic personality and were particularly cognisant of Jeffreys' persuasiveness with church members. Therefore, they instructed ministers not to invite Jeffreys to the churches for any reason at all.⁸⁷⁷ The tenor of the pamphlets centred on logic, argument and historical development. Phillips' strategy was to allow people to see Jeffreys' position, and to his mind the futility of it, without being able to hear the force of Jeffreys' delivery of his philosophy in person. He believed that this would simply cloud the issues.

Greenway encouraged Phillips in his view,

Unless we can shake the faith of the members in George Jeffreys, he will always remain an idol of the crowd. I believe this can be done by a careful system of writing.⁸⁷⁸

In taking this attitude towards the churches, Phillips and the Executive Council were continuing Jeffreys' paternalistic attitude. Phillips did not believe that church members would be able to make rational decisions about Jeffreys' proposed reforms, but would simply be swayed by the force of his personality.

This process of reassessing the contribution made by Jeffreys was not confined to the general public; it also happened in the thinking of the leaders of the Movement. In 1942, Hathaway began to question the claims that Jeffreys had made for himself, and therefore, began to dismantle the mystique that had

⁸⁷⁷ Ministerial Circular 20 February 1941.

⁸⁷⁸ Letter, H.W. Greenway to Phillips, 6 August 1941.

arisen around him. He wrote to Phillips enclosing a list of churches that Jeffreys had not opened. These were churches that had been opened by others or which had already been in existence before his campaigns.⁸⁷⁹

Phillips, from this information, estimated that only one in three churches had been founded by Jeffreys and suggested that Hathaway include this in the next Ministerial Circular.⁸⁸⁰ That Phillips suggested this is interesting since it could indicate that Hathaway's investigation had not been undertaken for general dissemination, but out of his own interest. This would support the view that a general reassessment was being undertaken by even Jeffreys' closest workers. Hathaway demonstrated the perceived significance attached to this when he replied, 'Pastor Brewster and I had quite a thrill when from memory I named well over 100 that I could think were not founded by George Jeffreys'.⁸⁸¹ This revision of history, and attempt to put Jeffreys' influence in perspective, was necessary if Elim were to survive without him.

7. Facing the reality of the situation within Elim

By 1943, Elim were facing major pressures on their structures. In particular, Hathaway chafed under what he viewed as the suffocating bureaucratic system of church government. He blamed Jeffreys for it being necessary, but felt that the system had to be changed if the work was to continue effectively. He criticised the 'cumbersome organisation of the Conference' and lamented that they had been 'burdened with a Constitution which in many ways is admirable

⁸⁷⁹ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 30 December 1942.

⁸⁸⁰ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 2 January 1943.

⁸⁸¹ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 5 January 1943.

but which contains intricacies which I think can and should be eliminated'.⁸⁸²

For him to make any criticism to Phillips was potentially destabilising, since Phillips had invested so much of his time and effort in the formulation of the Constitution. Hathaway also recognised and communicated to Phillips that the mutual trust that had existed between the ministers and the Executive Council pre-1940 had evaporated. This was evidenced in that Headquarters' officers were increasingly being challenged by local churches as to their right to be involved in local affairs. This, together with the 'uncharitable view taken by some towards HQ in the sittings of Conference' meant that the leadership of the Movement had become considerably weakened.⁸⁸³

In October 1943, F.G. Cloke resigned from the Executive Council and the ministry of the Elim churches. Prior to his resignation, he wrote a letter consisting of seven closely typed foolscap pages, outlining the problems he believed faced the Movement. In blunt words and broad, bold statements he alleged that the Movement had watered down Pentecostal truths, been too divided on doctrinal issues, had been 'smothered by rules and regulations, and accepted expedient forms of government' which were 'unscriptural, unspiritual and weak'.⁸⁸⁴ He called for a 'united, intelligent scriptural understanding of the things of Pentecost', for a 'firm, definite stand' to be taken on vital doctrinal issues and for the recognition of 'anointed' leaders, rather than 'committees of local men'.⁸⁸⁵ This call for the recognition of charismatic leaders lends ironic

⁸⁸² Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 27 August 1943.

⁸⁸³ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 31 August 1943.

⁸⁸⁴ Letter F.G. Cloke to Executive Council, 15 October 1943.

⁸⁸⁵ Ibid.

credence to Wilson's view that 'routine administrative devices, written instructions and defined spheres of competence replace the spontaneity of charismatic impulse'.⁸⁸⁶ However, possibly his most sobering charge presented to the Council was that the 'Council is largely responsible for the present state of the Movement'.⁸⁸⁷ If there had been the tendency to blame Jeffreys for the unrest and disruption, Cloke addressed it incisively,

I have not overlooked the fact that the conduct of Mr Jeffreys and his followers was a great injury to God's work, but they were not the whole of the Executive Council, and it is not just to say that they were wholly responsible for the conduct of the Movement.⁸⁸⁸

His resignation letter, including this report, was sent to all the ministers on the day of his resignation, 20 October 1943. There could be little disguising that the Movement was in the gravest danger of extinction.⁸⁸⁹

In many ways, this letter was symptomatic of the issues that many people felt confronted Elim. It pointed to the low morale of churches, of the need for a return to their core values and the need for a fresh start. Phillips acknowledged that,

There is a lot in what he says re. Elim's drift from Pentecost. I think the same applies, but to a lesser extent, to the A.O.G. The sooner we return to Holiness, Pentecost and Evangelism the better.⁸⁹⁰

In 1941, Bradley had written to Phillips,

It will be a great thing if we could get back to those Fundamentals of Elim which distinguished us from all the other Evangelical bodies, namely Divine Healing and a greater understanding of the Gifts of the Spirit. If we lose these, then there seems to be no reason for our existence as a separate body, and I fear that we are getting away from these very quickly.⁸⁹¹

⁸⁸⁶ Wilson, 45.

⁸⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁸⁹ Cloke went to Southport where he began a church on Apostolic lines, though independent from any denomination.

⁸⁹⁰ Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 17 October 1943.

⁸⁹¹ Letter, J.T. Bradley to Phillips, 5 October 1941.

It was not suggested by any that these central doctrines were no longer believed, they simply were not being practised and there was little expectation that they would be experienced in the churches. For example, in April 1943, Phillips was readmitted to hospital diagnosed as having tuberculosis on his left lung. Molly Phillips asked the ministers to pray that God would heal as 'in the early days'. She saw her husband's illness to be a 'challenge to the grand old truth we once so loudly and triumphantly proclaimed - Divine Healing'.⁸⁹² That she appealed to their memories of previous days is indicative of the lack of miraculous healing that was being reported generally.

7.1 Attention drawn to the need for evangelism

The other area to which many turned their attention was evangelism. Although Phillips had suggested the re-formation of the Elim Evangelistic Band as early as 1941, nothing had happened.⁸⁹³ This was followed by a resolution at the 1942 Conference that a number of evangelists be appointed. However, since no nominations were received, the scheme was not implemented.⁸⁹⁴ A much more radical scheme was suggested by Kingston. He suggested that another training school should be formed. Because he recognised that Elim had relied on Jeffreys and the Revival Party exclusively for the Movement's evangelistic policy, he believed that Elim could not simply appoint other evangelists, since they did not have any who were suitably experienced. He argued that the existing Bible College was not suitably equipped to train evangelists, since

⁸⁹² Letter to Ministers M. Phillips, 14 April 1943.

⁸⁹³ Ibid. 'In reply to your letter of the 30th ult. re. the proposed formation of the Elim Evangelistic Band let me say I think this is a splendid thing and will doubtless have great benefit upon our work.'

⁸⁹⁴ Minutes Representative Session, Monday, 14 September 1942.

their main remit was to provide the churches with pastors. Kingston's plan was to establish an 'Evangel College' run on faith lines, to encourage the poor and under-privileged to attend to be taught by a 'faculty of evangelists who would teach people for two terms the principles of evangelism'.⁸⁹⁵ Although nothing came of the plan, all the various schemes highlighted the fact that everyone realised that the answer to the problems of the Movement would be found in the reaffirmation of evangelism. This would result in the growth of existing churches, the increase of resources and the restoration of morale.

Six months later, Hathaway recognised the need for more than mere talk about evangelism, writing, 'the main thing is not planning but to have someone or some party who can get on with the job'.⁸⁹⁶ In 1942, it had been suggested that he should be the organiser of the evangelistic work, opening new churches in 'untouched districts'.⁸⁹⁷ However, due to the pressures of maintaining the churches and the exigencies of the war, he had not been able to fulfil this role. During 1944, he suggested that a new Crusade should be launched. This would be a chance for people to dedicate themselves to a 'higher standard among us all, and of turning the minds and hearts of our people to more definite service for the Lord and consecrated activity and prayer'.⁸⁹⁸ He believed that Elim ministers had become cynical and critical to such an extent that a new scheme would not be easily accepted. Surprisingly, he included Phillips among these ranks:

⁸⁹⁵ Letter, C. Kingston to Hathaway, 29 March 1943.

⁸⁹⁶ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 1 September 1943.

⁸⁹⁷ Ministerial Circular, 18 June 1942.

⁸⁹⁸ Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 5 April 1944.

I know you will the join the critics in some measure, so say all you want to say as freely and frankly as you wish.⁸⁹⁹

It is noteworthy that Hathaway, on outlining this scheme, felt it necessary to reassure Phillips that, whilst they may differ over issues, they would 'not fall to pieces over this',⁹⁰⁰ nor was it Hathaway's intention to 'start a separate Movement, or go out of Elim'.⁹⁰¹ That Hathaway, the Field Superintendent, felt it necessary to reassure the Secretary General in such explicit terms, indicates the underlying fear that lay in Phillips' mind. Presumably, the memory of the establishment of the World Revival Crusade had caused Phillips to fear the repercussions of another semi-autonomous Crusade.⁹⁰² Accordingly, he expressed his concern lest the management of such a scheme was overseen by ministers, rather than by the Executive Council.⁹⁰³ However, when this scheme, and more particularly the motivation behind the scheme, was introduced to the 1944 Conference, it found a ready response.

8. The 1944 Conference

This Conference was a turning point for Elim. It was a time of corporate confession of the failures of the past and a determination to return to the central issues in the future. On Thursday, 11 May, a resolution was discussed proposing a call to prayer. Kingston urged the ministers to examine their own

899

Ibid.

900

Letter, Hathaway to Phillips, 3 May 1944.

901

Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 4 May 1944.

902

When Hathaway sent proofs of the aims of the Crusade to Phillips in November, Phillips replied, 'Ms is returned herewith. I have marked a part of it on p.2 which 99 out of every 100 would read to mean that you launched this entirely on your own, and that it is your Crusade, whereas it was, of course, entirely your idea, but launched by the Executive. It is really essential that you should introduce somewhere in these lines that it was approved by the Elim Conference and launched by Elim.' Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 23 November 1944.

903

Letter, Phillips to Hathaway, 5 May 1944.

spiritual lives and to promise to inspire their congregations to become concerned for the fate of non-believers. He requested that a 'fresh co-ordinated programme of evangelical effort throughout the country' be launched, stating that this should not be 'a temporary expedient, but a perpetual plan of action'.⁹⁰⁴ Hathaway responded to this, expressing his wish that all the 'unnecessary business' would be swept aside in favour of the work of evangelism. This loss of zeal for evangelism, along with the change of attitudes among the ministers, was acknowledged by Ladlow. He argued that competition between ministers and churches had overcome a spirit of co-operation.⁹⁰⁵ Smith suggested that the answer to the present problems was not to be found in 'big preachers', nor, in Quest's words, the facile attempts to 'hatch schemes and to coin dogmas'. Smith pointed out that whilst 'we could put our hands on certain personalities and blame them', the ministers should acknowledge that 'we have sinned and have lost the power'.⁹⁰⁶ Walker agreed, stating, 'we have to face the fact that we have failed the Lord'.⁹⁰⁷ Into this arena, Hathaway introduced his suggestion of a new Covenant card that could be used by ministers and churches as part of a new Crusade. The session finished with two hours of 'prayer and deep heart-searching during which a great spiritual surge swept over the Conference'.⁹⁰⁸

This Conference was significant for many reasons. It allowed the ministers to express their own dissatisfaction with the spiritual state of the Movement, and

⁹⁰⁴ "A touch from God at Conference" Elim Evangel 5 June 1944, 178.

⁹⁰⁵ Ibid., 179.

⁹⁰⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁰⁷ Ibid., 183.

⁹⁰⁸ Ibid., 188.

possibly more significantly, hear the senior ministers and leaders express their own disillusionment. For example, Joseph Smith referred to the fact that he had been in Elim longer than any others present and that he believed that 'this work is coming down to bedrock'.⁹⁰⁹ It was important for all the ministers to know that any disillusionment that they may have been experiencing was not unique to themselves. The very act of airing publicly the fears for the future that many shared, had a cohesive effect on the gathered body of ministers and representatives.

Secondly, possibilities for the future were discussed in such a way that people left the Conference feeling confident that they had averted the possibility of the Movement dying through lack of morale. Hardman, reporting on the week's events, wrote, 'We all returned to our respective churches, realising that, under the hand of God, for Elim there is a glorious future'.⁹¹⁰ This sentence was more than just the reiteration of unsubstantiated hollow triumphalism. Before the Conference began, many had felt that there was no future for Elim, let alone a glorious one. Bradley, reflecting on this period, wrote that ministers were not sure that they would survive this upheaval, stating,

The writer well recollects returning home from the Conference at which George Jeffreys announced his resignation and meditating on the situation with the thought, "This is the end of my ministry in Elim, for the congregations will rally to a man to George Jeffreys and you will now find a secular job." Doubtless every minister thought the same.⁹¹¹

In these circumstances, that any could return home believing that they would be able to retain the viability of the Movement was indeed a triumph.

⁹⁰⁹ Ibid., 178.

⁹¹⁰ Hardman, J. "Another milestone passed" Elim Evangel 5 June 1944, 184.

⁹¹¹ Bradley, J.T. "Editorial", Elim Evangel 6 November 1965, 710.

Thirdly, the Conference acknowledged that they could not continue to blame Jeffreys for all the Movement's problems. In the past, as they accused him for the break up of the denomination, they absolved themselves from any responsibility. By 1944, it was clear that the majority of ministers wanted to cease the hostility with Jeffreys and proceed with more proactive measures to build the Movement. The final significance is that it was thought appropriate to include some of the major speeches in the Elim Evangel. The events of the previous years had gravely affected the church members; the brave editorial decision to include the soul-searching evidenced at the Conference can be interpreted as an attempt to demonstrate to the members that the problems would not be allowed to continue unaddressed.

By 1946, Boulton, the incumbent President, addressed the Annual Conference and explained that 'we have passed through the dark, sad night of our great betrayal and crucifixion, and we are now moving to what may well prove to be the re-birth of the work we love. We have stood at what looked like, and that some thought was, and others hoped was, the grave of Elim. But, thank God, the flag of Elim is not flying half mast high'.⁹¹²

9. The role of P.S. Brewster

The major impact of the departure of Jeffreys from Elim was that the Movement lost its greatest evangelistic asset. Although his greatest evangelistic days in

⁹¹² Greenway, H.W. "The Elim Conference", Elim Evangel 24 June 1946, 292.

terms of visibility were behind him, pastors from 1934-40 had still relied on Jeffreys to a large extent. Canty remembered,

Some of the men were not always wise and in those days it seemed so easy when George Jeffreys came along to get a crowd, if your church went down, send for George Jeffreys and get the crowd back.⁹¹³

One of the major reasons that Elim was survived during this period was that it found a replacement for Jeffreys in Brewster.

Following the 1944 Conference, an Evangelistic Council was established. At its first meeting in January 1945, the Council consisted of W.G. Hathaway, P.S. Brewster, J. Woodhead, S. Gorman and A. Russell.⁹¹⁴ Their aim was to carry out campaigns in Lancashire. The first of these evangelistic campaigns was held in Wigan during July-August by P.S. Brewster. This was the first major outreach that had been conducted since Jeffreys had left, and was a public test of the future viability of Elim evangelistic campaigns without him. Canty, recollecting the impact of this campaign, wrote that when he saw that a church had been established in Wigan, 'I knew that it would be all right'.⁹¹⁵ With great joy, Hathaway reported that the campaign, run over seven weeks, had seen over 600 people respond to the call for conversion.⁹¹⁶ Although other ministers were employed in pioneer evangelism, such as J. Woodhead and K. Matthews, it was Brewster who was the main agent of extending the Elim denomination from the mid-1940s to the 1970s.⁹¹⁷

⁹¹³ Canty, G. Taped Interview with author, 24 May 1993.

⁹¹⁴ Hathaway, W.G. "Elim's Policy of Pioneer Evangelism", Elim Evangel 8 August 1946, 321.

⁹¹⁵ Canty, G. "The Past? What Past?" Elim Evangel 6 November 1965, 721.

⁹¹⁶ Hathaway, W.G. "Elim's Policy of Pioneer Evangelism", Elim Evangel 8 August 1946, 321 and Brewster, P.S. "The Wigan campaign - 8 months after" Elim Evangel 4 February 1946, 56.

⁹¹⁷ P.S. Brewster lived from 1908-1980.

His relationship with Headquarters, in effect Phillips, was not always an easy one, with frustrations being expressed on occasions by both parties. At times, Brewster showed his impatience with Headquarters if his demands for workers for the churches he was opening met any hesitant response due to the lack of available personnel. He regarded the work of planting churches as of the uttermost importance.⁹¹⁸ Headquarters often expressed their dependency upon Brewster. As early as 1947, he was being viewed as the natural evangelistic successor to Jeffreys. At a time when Hathaway was outlining the difficulties he faced as Field Superintendent, since there were so many married ministers who needed higher wages and so many small churches, he wrote the following to Brewster:

The remedy is more campaigns, more new churches. Somehow I fancy I see in my vision a gentleman who resides in Cardiff holding in his hand a key, a golden key, and I rather think that this gentleman holds the solution to the problem. No I have not been crystal gazing, but I have been praying.⁹¹⁹

This comparison of himself with Jeffreys was one that Brewster was aware of himself. He had always had a close personal connection with Jeffreys. He had been converted under his ministry in the East End of London in 1924 and prior to entering Bible College worked in the churches that had been newly established following Jeffreys' campaigns in Birmingham. After Jeffreys' departure from Elim he said, 'It was one of the saddest days of my life when he resigned from Elim'.⁹²⁰ He refused to allow himself to get into the same position as Jeffreys had done, by refusing to become involved in any administrative

⁹¹⁸ For example, Letter P.S. Brewster to Phillips, 27 May 1946.

⁹¹⁹ Letter, Hathaway to P.S. Brewster, 18 January 1947.

⁹²⁰ Unpub. ms memoir of Brewster's life, by Brewster.

affairs of the Movement, preferring to concentrate on the ministries for which he felt he was gifted. In 1950, Phillips invited him to stand as vice-president.

Brewster indicated that he would be willing to stand, as long as he could continue his evangelistic work, explaining, 'we have seen the havoc caused by George Jeffreys entering too much into the administration and we must learn by these experiences'.⁹²¹ Brewster was dedicated to his evangelistic work and to his ministry at the Cardiff City Temple. He was the pastor for 35 years, and if events in Cardiff clashed with national events, he always put his local church first to the extent that, at times, Phillips thought he should have given a higher priority to the national events.⁹²²

A source of frustration was the amount of work that Phillips expected Brewster to be involved with. In 1953, A.C. Valdez,⁹²³ an American evangelist, had been invited by the Assemblies of God to services in Harrogate, where they were seeking to establish a church. In order to protect the Elim church, Phillips asked Brewster to go to do a series of meetings at the same time.⁹²⁴ Brewster replied,

One can only do so much in a day and so many campaigns in a year, and I am sure that you will appreciate I am running my church as well as preaching practically every night this year. My life is not easy at the moment.⁹²⁵

⁹²¹ Letter, P.S. Brewster to Phillips, 31 August 1950.

⁹²² In 1952, Brewster wanted to be released from attending the Royal Albert all Easter Monday celebrations. He had booked the Pavilion Hall, Cardiff which would hold 3,000 people. This was not happily accepted by Phillips.

⁹²³ Valdez, Jnr., was an evangelist who travelled extensively with his father (1896-1988). His father had been present as a child at the Azusa Street meetings, 1906-1909. Zeigler, J.R. "Valdez, A.C." q.v. Burgess et al., 868.

⁹²⁴ Letter, Phillips to P.S. Brewster, 9 February 1953.

⁹²⁵ Letter P.S. Brewster to Phillips, 10 February 1953.

However, during his ministry, Brewster opened over 40 churches.⁹²⁶ He remained the evangelist who, apart from Jeffreys, made the greatest impact on Elim. His significance was greater than simply the number of churches that were opened, though this was important. At a time when Elim had lost a charismatic leader who had filled some of the largest halls in Britain, they discovered another, who although he would not see the same size of crowds, did make an impact in the towns he visited. It needs to be remembered that Brewster was working in a post-war, socially dislocated setting when even Jeffreys himself did not see the same large numbers of people attending his services.⁹²⁷

Generally, it is noteworthy, and more than merely coincidental, that Elim, the Assemblies of God⁹²⁸ and the Apostolic Church⁹²⁹ were facing the same fears regarding a loss of spiritual vitality at the same time, that is around 1940. Gee reporting on that period pointed to the 'indefinable differences'⁹³⁰ which were discernible in Pentecostalism compared to its earliest days and believed that this indicated that something in Pentecostalism had been lost. Allen, supporting Gee's contention, points out that the number of healings testified to was considerably fewer in the 1940s than had been the case in the late

⁹²⁶ Jones, R. "P.S. Brewster - Elim's Great Leader" Elim Evangel 16 August 1980, 7.

⁹²⁷ Although Jeffreys did still attract large crowds, see, e.g., Lloyd, A. "George Jeffreys" Picture Post 11 May 1946, 10-13.

⁹²⁸ Allen, D. Signs and Wonders: Origins, Growth, Development and Significance of Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland, 1900-1980 Ph.D.diss., University of London, 1990, 197-198.

⁹²⁹ Llewellyn, 55. 'Ministerial hierarchy, area committees and other organisational paraphernalia had assumed a level of importance disproportionate to their effectiveness in promoting the Christian gospel.' Interestingly the Apostolic Church spent the war years disputing amongst itself the benefits, or otherwise, of their newly introduced constitution.

⁹³⁰ Gee, (1967) 203.

1920s-1930s.⁹³¹ The changes in society during the immediate pre-war period caught the Pentecostals off-guard, and they were not able to respond to society as they had done ten years previously. That, coupled with the impact of the War and the subsequent rebuilding of the nation, resulted in a firm marginalisation of Pentecostalism.⁹³² Unlike the aftermath of the First World War in 1918, the nation was prepared for the rebuilding of the state after the Second World War. The foundations of the Welfare State, the demobilisation which was more thoughtfully monitored, the new housing and general social optimism led to a 'better standard of living, a fairer share of the nation's production, more equal opportunities'.⁹³³ Whilst rationing did lead to some deprivation, at least everyone was treated officially equally. The world had changed, with British society feeling the full rush of modernism. Whilst the Assemblies of God and the Apostolic Church had to work through their own answers to the societal changes, Elim were able to explain the changes in terms of their own internal problems of the previous five years. In other words they did not have to face the implications of the modernisation of society. The methods Elim suggested as being the remedy for their ills were the same solutions that had been implemented in the 1924-34 period. The problem of the split for Elim was that it masked certain elements of societal changes in their thinking about how to reach the country with the Gospel. Their answer to the declension in their ranks was to raise up other evangelists in the mould of

⁹³¹ Allen, 198.

⁹³² One indicator of this marginalisation could be the reduced media coverage of any of the major Pentecostal meetings that took place after the War, compared to pre-War coverage.

⁹³³ Grenville, J.A.S. Collins History of the World in the Twentieth Century (London: Harper Collins, 1994) 348.

Jeffreys. Initially, the success of the pre-War methodology vindicated their actions. The pioneer evangelism resulted in 34 churches being brought into existence between 1944 and 1954. The next ten years resulted in 49 new churches. However, between 1964 and 1974, a decade when all the changes in society that had been hinted at since the War came to fruition, only 11 churches were added.⁹³⁴ Wilson's perceptive comment is that the revival activity became that of 'the planned proselytising of a denomination' rather than the 'spontaneous, unorganised and naive desire to convert the nation'.⁹³⁵

However, Brewster gave confidence to the Movement's evangelistic efforts and was also able to encourage younger men to follow his example. Some of the evangelists who would be involved in the 1960s onwards, for example, Wynne Lewis and Alex Tee, began their ministry under the tutelage of Brewster.

10. Failed attempts at mediation

Among the many calls from individual churches for the two parties to come to some agreement, one individual, Bertram Sandwith, sent letters to both Phillips and Jeffreys. He wrote that, 'it seemed as if the enemy had triumphed almost completely' and that the Spirit 'who is so sensitive to any bitterness of heart or criticism, cannot operate in blessing in either your Movement or the Elim work while the present state of things exist'.⁹³⁶ In reply, both Phillips and Jeffreys sent copies of pamphlets which summarised their positions.⁹³⁷ Sandwith

⁹³⁴ Between 1915 and 1937, 233 Elim churches were established.

⁹³⁵ Wilson, 58.

⁹³⁶ Letter, B. Sandwith to Jeffreys and Phillips, 24 February 1942.

⁹³⁷ Letter, Phillips to B. Sandwith, 29 February 1942; Jeffreys to B. Sandwith, 27 February 1942.

suggested that both should meet 'without reservation or preconditions'.⁹³⁸

Phillips replied, arguing that it would be impossible to meet Jeffreys, since the argument was not between Jeffreys and Headquarters, but Jeffreys and the 'whole of the Elim Movement'.⁹³⁹ The correspondence was ended by Sandwith who wrote, 'Quite frankly I am disappointed that neither of you seemed to be willing to lay aside all the points at issue and to meet in a real spirit of love to seek His mind only'.⁹⁴⁰

In 1948, James Salter chaired a Pentecostal Unity Conference, with delegates from the Assemblies of God (J. Canter, D. Gee, J. Salter), Elim (Phillips, Hathaway, J. Morgan), Apostolic (V. Wellings, H. Chaunter, J.L. Lindsay) and the Bible pattern Fellowship (R. Tweed, G.I. Francis). They met from 24-25 August in London, with the purpose of maintaining a spirit of unity, by recognising each other's activities and co-operating in the work of evangelism. Although the doctrinal basis referred to no ecclesiological governmental matters, the Pattern delegation demanded that the freedom of the local church be adhered to by all the delegates. The others felt that this should not be imposed upon them. Phillips revealed his unhappiness with the situation, stating 'it was sheer mockery to come together to seek fellowship and unity with organisations which persist in publishing pamphlets, articles and booklets directly attacking another organisation'. He felt that unless these were withdrawn, fellowship would be impossible.⁹⁴¹ The Pattern delegation believed

⁹³⁸ Letter, B. Sandwith to Phillips, 2 March 1942.

⁹³⁹ Letter, Phillips to B Sandwith, 5 March 1942.

⁹⁴⁰ Letter, B. Sandwith to Phillips, 25 March 1942.

⁹⁴¹ Pamphlet Pentecostal Unity Conference. (Pattern Bookroom, n.d.)

it was their duty to attack what it saw as unbiblical practices and voted against a motion censuring one organisation attacking another. They then took their leave from the Unity Conference.

By the following year, this self-ostracism extended to the World Pentecostal Fellowship, which was condemned as being another example of a totalitarian system of central church government.⁹⁴² The Pattern position was that they were the sole guardians of 'God-given freedom'.⁹⁴³

This persistent hostile reaction was also maintained by the Elim church. When, for example, it became necessary to discuss the possibilities of disposing of the church building in Brighton, Elim displayed an intransigence that equalled that of Jeffreys. The Elim Church that had met in The Lanes, Brighton had always been under the sole trusteeship of Jeffreys. After his death in 1962, the church requested that the Elim Trust Corporation, who now controlled the church building, lease it to the existing congregation so that they might continue to worship there. Greenway, referring to the fact that 'Elim has been likened to Babylon' announced that it was not in Elim's interest to grant the request 'to an organisation which has carried on a propaganda campaign against Elim and has persisted in hostility against Elim and its form of government for so many years'.⁹⁴⁴

⁹⁴² Pamphlet "An Open letter to Pentecostal people everywhere" (London: Crystal Publications, n.d.) 2. Edsor, (1964) 50-53.

⁹⁴³ Pamphlet "An Open Letter..", 4.

⁹⁴⁴ Letter H.W. Greenway to members of Conference, 26 October 1962.

Part Three: Summary and Conclusion

The split within Elim was a defining event for all those involved, both pastors and members. At the 1944 Representative Conference, Smith pointed out that,

Many of you ministers have been brought into the work in circumstances which have placed you at disadvantage. Some of you started at the wrong end. The work was blown up more than built up.⁹⁴⁵

This notwithstanding, the departure of Jeffreys from the Movement was a relief for those who had been most closely involved with him. The emotional energy that had been expended over the previous ten years had taken its toll, particularly on Phillips. However, the loss was simultaneously a devastating event. Many expected that with Jeffreys' departure, the Movement would disintegrate. That Jeffreys had allowed so much of the public work to be directed round his own role confirmed these fears.

Elim survived the loss of Jeffreys as their leader by the means of three broad actions. They ensured that people were able to make theological sense of the split by their demonisation of Jeffreys: he was portrayed as unstable, a victim of his own sin and an arrogant agent of Satan. Secondly, Phillips and the Executive Council fought actively for the survival of Elim by presenting their own arguments through pamphlets, disciplining ministers who showed any evidence of supporting Jeffreys, retaining property by force and appealing directly to Pattern ministers to leave their new group and return to Elim. The third general means by which Elim was saved was by the willingness of leaders to face up to reality, reassess the past and provide a vision for the future. Jeffreys' contribution to Elim was reassessed, this was a vital component in

⁹⁴⁵

"A Touch from God at the Conference" Elim Evangel 5 June 1944, 178.

Elim's fight for survival. He had been viewed as so central to the birth and growth of Elim that life without him was unimaginable. In an attempt to reassess his significance, however flawed that attempt may have been, Elim ministers were encouraged to believe that future success was not dependent upon Jeffreys. Thus, Brewster's role is seen to be absolutely fundamental in Elim's survival. Although, he was not as successful as Jeffreys had been, it is unlikely that in the new social climate anyone could have been.

This survival of the Movement after the fissure was not an easy process and during the years 1940-1945 it was not thought inevitable. Wearied by the denomination's battles and the country's warfare with Germany, Canty's comments evoke the sentiment of that time,

In 1946 we had to begin again without our old leadership, with a new constitution in a world that had completely changed and with a new generation. The difficulties were staggering to our faith. Ministers who had once held very large pastorates now struggled with a few dozen supporters in drab, war-weary premises.⁹⁴⁶

Phillips in particular is to be credited for the survival of the Movement. Having worked so hard to protect the Movement from the damage he believed Jeffreys would inflict upon it, he was unwilling for the Movement to collapse once Jeffreys had left.

⁹⁴⁶

Canty, G. "The Past? What Past?" Elim Evangel 6 November 1965, 720.

Final Summary and Conclusion

In 1940, with Jeffreys' second and final resignation from the Elim Movement, ministers and laity feared that their denomination had become so weakened that it would disintegrate. This thesis has charted the reasons for this disintegration in 1940. The first major section examined the implicit reasons for the split, suggesting that there were elements within Jeffreys' personality that made him susceptible to the problems that emerged in the late 1930s. Prepared to hold to minority theological positions, his self-confidence was enhanced by his evangelistic success. He was Britain's greatest evangelist throughout this period and therefore expected that his views would be accepted on the basis that if God was blessing him so signally, his theological views could not be erroneous. Protected by the Revival Party and applauded by the general public, he could only see opposition as persecution. For all these reasons it was argued that it was increasingly unlikely that Jeffreys would be able to continue to lead a denomination that had become increasingly organised.

The reason that Jeffreys' personality was not allowed to dominate the development of Elim, however, was due to Phillips. A brilliant mind and a marvellous debater he was a match for Jeffreys' charismatic flair. Just as determined as Jeffreys and as single-minded in his opinions, he was dedicated to the ongoing success of Elim. Phillips was the rock on which Jeffreys would break.

The fracture that occurred in 1940 was the result of seven years of disagreements over a number of specific issues and part two of the thesis detailed these. The situation in Ireland was the prelude to the arguments between Jeffreys and Phillips concerning the role of local church government. Phillips' suspicion that Jeffreys only wanted to allow churches to exercise self-government because of a desire to introduce British Israelism into Elim as a supplementary belief was reinforced by the formation of Jeffreys' independent evangelistic organisation in 1936. If Jeffreys was no longer reliant on Elim for his ministry and livelihood, he would be free to develop as he wished, not necessarily as the denomination wished. When Phillips fell ill in 1937, Jeffreys saw a chance to introduce changes into the financial arrangements of the Movement. According to his scheme, each church would become self-financing. Phillips was enraged by what he perceived to be Jeffreys' scare-mongering incompetence and also recognised that if churches were self-financing they would soon become self-governing. Phillips refused to get involved in any of Jeffreys' financial schemes but rather attempted to discredit each of them. It was another mark of their deteriorating relationship.

The most detailed section detailing the explicit reasons for the schism dealt with church government issues. At times, Jeffreys' suggestions were convoluted and increasingly dismissed as impracticable by Phillips. The arguments involved in the government of churches reveal the clergy-laity divide present within Elim at that time, and in particular the fear that the clergy had of laity being involved in leadership.

The third section of the thesis briefly dealt with the aftermath of the schism and the survival of the denomination. Phillips was determined that the denomination would survive and was involved in a number of measures that ensured Elim's continuance as a denomination. Overall, the major reason that Elim survived the loss of Jeffreys was due to Phillips' endeavours. In many senses, as has become clear, there had been a struggle for the leadership of the denomination happening for almost a decade before Jeffreys left. Greenway portrayed Phillips as rescuing the Movement 'on critical occasions [...] from complete disaster'.⁹⁴⁷ However, as has been demonstrated, it may be more accurate to suggest that Phillips survived a long period of attrition during which on many occasions he believed the Movement to be at risk. Phillips was viewed by his contemporaries as a skilled administrator, utterly devoted to the Movement, but one who would be very unlikely to take any risks. Events surrounding the arguments with Jeffreys hardened this cautious attitude. Fundamentally, that attitude became the predominant one in the Movement for the next 40 years. One indication of the settled nature of the denomination during this period is demonstrated by the fact that the Deed Poll was unchanged between 1942 and 1971, when Phillips' name was removed. However, in more recent days it has been amended in 1988, 1989, 1990, 1994 and 1996.

Because of the pressure that Jeffreys placed upon the Movement issues such as district presbyteries, lay representation, local church diaconates voted by

⁹⁴⁷ Cf. Greenway, H.W. "Well done ... faithful servant" Elim Evangel 22 September 1973, 3.

the members of the church, all eventually became accepted as part of the constitution. Canty's comment, 'Elim as we know it only became what it is at that time (1940)'⁹⁴⁸ is true. The irony is that all that Jeffreys argued for, with the exception of churches having the deeds of their property returned, was accepted after he left. Thus, it can be inferred that by the time Jeffreys left the Movement his arguments for the necessity for change had been accepted. However, the reason that his proposals were only acceptable after his departure was due to the perceived threat that he was to the existing organisational structure of the Movement.

On the whole, the history of the Movement is not well known amongst the Elim members.⁹⁴⁹ Although the Movement operates in the way it does because of the conflict between Jeffreys and Phillips, the history behind the development has largely gone unnoticed. Apart from an in-built tendency for Pentecostals to discount history in favour of the 'new thing' that God is always deemed to be doing, for the ministers involved in the events at the time, the pain of the split was so great that it became a thing unspoken. Like a family traumatised by divorce, the denomination, in time, refused to allude to the past and in particular to Jeffreys. However, there was an unexpected echo of the long-term impact of the split on the Movement in 1995.

⁹⁴⁸ Canty, G. "The Past? What Past?" Elim Evangel 6 November 1965, 720.

⁹⁴⁹ This despite the efforts that Cartwright made as editor of the Elim Evangel, during which time he wrote many articles detailing the historical development of the Movement. The publication of Hathaway's chapter in Pentecostal Perspectives may result in a new generation becoming aware of their own history.

In 1984, the Conference changed the name of the office of Secretary-General to that of General Superintendent. The change was designed to reflect a new role of spiritual leadership within the Movement. In 1994, Wynne Lewis, the General Superintendent, reported to the Conference that since Headquarters' Officers could only be appointed by the democratic vote of the Conference, it was virtually impossible for the General Superintendent to create 'his own team'.⁹⁵⁰ The following year he proposed a restructuring of the offices which would present a solution. He suggested that all Regional Superintendents would be automatically included on the Executive Council,⁹⁵¹ and that the International Missions Director and the Field Superintendent's positions would be replaced by that of Assistant General Superintendents.⁹⁵² Since the Executive Council would be enlarged, a smaller Executive Committee would be formed so that the full Council would not have to be convened for every decision that needed to be made.⁹⁵³ The significant addition to the Constitution was the explicit understanding that all the Headquarters Officers would 'act under the direction of the General Superintendent'.⁹⁵⁴

The discussions that ensued at the Conference raised many concerns about the projected changes. In particular, it was felt that to locate so much power in one man would be detrimental to the work of the denomination. The final speech on the matter was made by Wesley Gilpin⁹⁵⁵ who pointed out that he

⁹⁵⁰ Lewis, I.W. "General Superintendent's Report" 1994 Conference Reports (n.p., 1994), 4.

⁹⁵¹ Lewis, I.W. "Discussion Document regarding proposed revisions to Constitution" 1995 Conference Reports (separate document, n.p., 1995), 3.

⁹⁵² Ibid., 2.

⁹⁵³ Ibid., 4.

⁹⁵⁴ Ibid., 2.

⁹⁵⁵ Wesley Gilpin is a retired minister who was ordained within Elim in 1935. During his

had lived through the trauma that the centralisation of too much power in one person could cause.⁹⁵⁶ The proposal was subsequently dropped. Gilpin's speech was not the deciding feature, but it was significant that the tragic lessons of the Movement's history were brought to bear on issues being discussed fifty years after the split.

⁹⁵⁶ long career in Elim he was a member of the Executive Council and the Principal of the Elim Bible College from 1958-1980. Interview 21 April 1993, Bognor Regis. Tape of the Discussion, Elim Conference, 1995, Wed. 24 May.

Appendices

APPENDIX 1

E.J. Phillips' notes presented to Annual Conference⁹⁵⁷ General Survey - Tuesday Afternoon 21 November 1939.

We have been considering good many details. In order to get proper perspective, nec. to trace history of orgn in our work. Think you will bear with me, as I have had much more than anyone else to do with orgn of this work, & have been on govg body longer than anyone else - apart from Principal.

*History has been marked by
Policy of continual changes*

When first went to Belfast in 1919 nothing. No a/cs - no list of properties hopeless.

1922 1st Constitution. Drawn up by G.J. without consulting Overseers.

1923 Amended.

1925 New Constn.

1929 New Constn. & new rules.

1934 Deed Poll & new rules. (Not done in a hurry - discussed for years, main outline being as discussed with Pastor Henderson who dies 3 yrs previously.

1938 Agitation for a new Deed Poll.

Average: A new Constitution every 3 yrs.

Now propose to mention type of thing we have had to contend with, apart from new constitutions:

1928 Proposal to take over 7, Paternoster Row. Mr. Henderson, my bro. & self examined whole matter & strongly advised against it. G.J. insisted. Result: after 2 yrs withdrew & Alliance had to pay loss of over £1,500 to avoid public bankruptcy proceedings.

About same time. Proposed & insisted on commencement of the "Foursquare Revivalist". My bro. & self pleaded with him not to embark on it. Insisted. Did our best, but proved fiasco.

About same time. Pressed for shops all over the country. Started one at B'ton. Few years after wanted to wash his hands even of Pubg. Co. & said shd not trade at all.

⁹⁵⁷

These notes are reproduced exactly as the sheet that Phillips used. It was a typed sheet with handwritten notes included. These are represented here by italics. Some of the sentences had been crossed out by pen. I have included these omissions as they indicate what he had proposed to say before the speech.

- 1929 Started various sections in work against our will. *We always believed unity reqd. for strength.* Since then demanded all sorts of concessions to bring all sections together.
- 1929 Divisional Supt. System commenced. Worked splendidly until 1934, when scrapped by G.J. against advice of Hdqtrs. Why? Simply because he wanted to get rid of one or two of the D.S's & thought scrapping system wd be easiest way to do it. Left Ireland without anyone in authority - but deal with that when give you facts about Ireland. I will have a tragic story to tell about that. Apparently there is open rebellion there at present. I will prove how the Principal ~~alone~~ has been responsible for it.

B.I. 1932 B.I. agitation began. First at Conference of the Northern Division. Continual agitation behind scenes. ~~Strongest argument wd bring crowds of moneyed people into our work.~~ 1934 - discussion forced on Conf. Here I want to break in & shew (sic.) how the internal conflict going on for yrs. came into open - first at the 1934 & 1935 Conferences & then thro' our Churches. Look at the result CHART
G.J. & his schemes have been obstacle to forward move. Time & energy spent on them instead of advancing work. 1935 - veiled threats of leaving if B.I. not given liberty. Resolution passed & G.J. promised not to bring up matter again. Still pressed hard for next 3 yrs under cry "liberty of conscience". Yet in 1937 sd prepared to drop all prophetic teaching if we wd do same. *Conscience?* But after Conf. cry was still "liberty of conscience". I have on me a letter from G.J. dated Jan. this yr in which he says he is prepared to make it "Legally impossible for British Israelism to be taught in any Alliance Church" provided we grant lay repr. In other words he is selling his conscience for lay repr.

1/- a week. Then another "stunt": 1/- a week system. First phase of this obsession was that the Executive Council be elected by all Church members paying 1/- a week. After weeks of arguing, dropped. *Was this according to "the Pattern"?*

L.C.G. 1934 L.C.G. Scheme 1/- a week incorporated into that. It was to "sweep the country". Utter failure. Its mins. now blame the Executive for leading them up the garden, while simply put into force what G.J. demanded. Something more:

Nov. 28, 1934. Ex. met to discuss scheme. All elected members were present. Next day I wrote Principal: "Every one expressed surprise at the proposal to introduce a form of government which strikes at the very root of the Deed Poll, and asked why it was not suggested before we spent hundreds of pounds and months of discussion on the Deed Poll. The next thing I was faced with was this: Everyone who was present said they felt it was a means to

introduce B.I. into the work. I did not breathe a single word about B.I. I found a very strong opposition from this point of view." G.J. replied Dec. 4th: "In order to avoid any possible misunderstanding between us, I assure you as members of the Executive that my motive in seeking to launch a plan for these Local Government churches is not to provide ways and means to introduce this teaching into these churches." I confess to you I did not accept that asse. *Events later proved it was right.* A week or two after in drafting the rules I put in a clause that questions of doctrine outside the Fundamentals should be decided by the Executive. There was a deadlock. So on 21st Dec., 1934 at an Executive meeting I proposed a resolution that there should be liberty to preach B.I. in L.C.G. churches unless & until it spread to a stage when the Council felt it would be a menace to the rest of the work. The whole situation changed. G.J. shewed (sic.) his pleasure & the scheme was launched with his blessing. About 3 yrs later, (Spring of 1937) G.J. admitted that he introduced L.C.G. to make for purpose of making an outlet for B.I. Any wonder not prospered?

Debts 1937 Cry of financial crisis just because a/cs shewed (sic.) loss of £104 in year when Jubilee Fund raised nearly £7,000. All sorts of schemes drawn up & G.J. even considered selling Elim Woodlands. As a result of decisions then made some mins have been practically starving while we have been paying money off mortgages when mortgages were arranged for 15 yrs & cd easily have been pd out of church surplus, & lenders didn't want it back, & need not have been pd for 15 yrs - or not at all if the Lord came back before then. All this out of the Mins pockets. Shew (sic.) CHART.

Lay Rep. 1938 G.J. introduced lay repn. scheme. Accompanied by an ultimatum that if rejected he wd resign & tell the churches why. When pressed by Pastor Boulton he said he wd do this even if it split the work from top to bottom. This although only 4 in Gt. Brit. & 4 in Ireland knew of a desire for lay rep. in their churches. At end of Conference, when we had passed reslns proposed by G.J., he sd he was satisfied, & they had brought about "real unity of policy".

1939 As late as Jly 11 still pressing Lay Rep. Scheme. Accdg to his figures %age in favour of lay repn. same (or slightly less) than at last Conf. after a year's agitation.

Min. Conf. By Aug. 28 dropped it for the present & pressing Govt. by Minl. Conf. Remember at last yr's Conf. he said for years he had wanted to give Minl. Conf. more power. Yet he was responsible for the drastic changes made in 1937 without their consent. Further, he wanted to make far more drastic changes & told me how upset he was that the Deed Poll wd not allow him to do so without the permission of the Minl. Conference. It is time this Conf knew the facts. I am withholding them no longer.

Ireland 1938 Pressed for lay rpn. at 1938 Irish Conf. Since then been pressing for Irish property to be held by an Irish Executive, while opposes property here being held by Executive. Consistent? Enough to make angels weep.

~~Have had B.I. Sole trusteeships. 1/- week. L.C.G. Lay Rep. Minl Conf. Financial Crisis.~~

Elders New Introduction this yr. is Elders & Deacons in every Church & this now seems to be his latest publn. "The Pattern" to take priority over everything else. All those things, we have been told, wd sweep the country.

A week or so ago went thro' my files & found literally scores of schemes drawn up by G.J. - schemes G.J. never troubled you with, but troubled us for yrs. In addition literally hundreds if not a thousand letters during past yrs arguing & setting out all sorts of schemes. This has been going on for at least ten years. You have had a dose for only 4 months. During the past year or so pages & pages trying to prove there was a financial crisis in the work, that the debt was going up when it was going down by thousands of pounds, & a host of other things he doesn't understand.

If G.J. had been pressing for only one thing, then I would say give in for the sake of peace. But it is something different every year - & some are totally opposed in principle to the others. Listen: B.I., Local Ch. Govt., Sole Trusteeship, Lay Repn., Govt. by Mins, Elders in every church.

Fact is, not fighting for a principle, fighting for his own way - every scheme that comes into his head. One important matter ab. Ch. Govt. G.J. has never realised - Ch. members (especially evangelicals) are usually conservative, & will not tolerate frequent changes. All right in politics, but not here. *Unfortunately of latter years G.J. ceased to consult Hdqtrs. Has around him admirers and flatterers. If true friends wd point out his failures.*

Troubles in our work to-day entirely caused by G.J. Up to 1935 the name "Elim" was synonymous with Unity & Progress. If go on at present, will soon stink in the nostrils of Christians throughout country. Unrest, dissatisfaction amongst Mins. & Churches which is sapping the very life of the movement has been commenced & contd. by its Founder. I say it with a very heavy heart.

Submitted more than enough evidence to prove that G.J. totally unfitted for the business side of the work of God. I don't entirely blame him. Any doctor will tell you that symptoms of his illness are just those revealed in his corres. Apart from that, he is absolutely out of his depth in matters of organisation & business. On Aug. 6th this year he wrote me acknowledging his "unlimited knowledge & inexperience." Not alone in feeling shd entirely

give up business side of the work & devote himself to evangelical ministry for which he is so gifted. In Acts 6 the 12 called seven men for the business side of the work, & said "We will give ourselves continually to prayer & to do the ministry of the Word." If the Principal would only take his hands off the govt. of the work we wd forget the past & I believe there wd be a new lease of life for Elim. Left to ourselves, without interference, even now by the grace of God we can solve Elim's problems. I believe we cd evolve a scheme to solve the Irish problem. Apart from this I see a disaster, & we may as well face up to it. Bt if he wd ~~withdraw from the Executive~~, give up his power to appoint nominees, & promise not to interfere with the govt of the work in any way, the work cd be saved. If he would remain head of this work but with no more to say as to its govt. than King George vi has to the govt of this land, then we wd gladly work with him, & I believe once more the blessing of God wd rest on the Elim work which we love & for which we have almost given our life's blood.

Appendix 2. E.J. Phillips' unpublished hand-written notes presented to 1940 Ministerial Conference seconding a motion to rescind the 1935 Conference resolution to allow for the various prophetic views to be held by ministers.

British-Israel

Want to second motion.

Present attitude - neutrality. Wd have been satisfactory apart from 2 things:-

- 1) Determined effort on part of small minority to wreck it.
- 2) More important - continual stream of BI literature into Churches ("Pattern") & mins. not allowed to oppose.

Position vy serious. V. serious bcs culmination of determined effort to open Elim churches to B.I.

Briefly trace it. -

1934 Conf.⁹⁵⁸

Harm to work.

Diverts attention from things which really matter.

Lack of real soul-saving work (already in churches).

No end to rubbish preached (by young workers especially - only literature is B.I. publis !

Our people wd not be satisfied with identity only - cf Pentecostal people and baptism.

Increased opposition from all sources except B.I. Double opposition in future.

Division in Churches caused by some preaching for & some against.

*>

Opening door to split work on other subjects (e.g. Eternal Security).

Prospered without (as no other).

Terrible risk - all for something of little value even if true.

No part of the Great Commission or of "Faith once for all delivered to the Saints".

_ * Mr Leech, if we are convinced that to preach B.I. in our churches wd split them, wd y advise us to keep it out?

_ [If G.J. preaches & not others, our people will go to B.I. mtgs & present divisions intensified]

(Overshadows miracle of Jews & fulfilled prophecy.

Bride made to refer to Israel only.

No advantage except draw in few B.I.'s - to spread their strange beliefs.)

1932 Agitation began. First at Conf. of Northern Division. Continued agitation behind scenes.

1934 Discussion forced on Conf. under threat of resignation. This is when our serious troubles in Elim began - and they began over B.I.

⁹⁵⁸ These notes were presented in the 1934 Conference debate between Phillips and Leech.

1935 Veiled threats by G.J. at Conf that wd leave if B.I. not given liberty.

Resolution passed at Conf. G.J. promised solemnly not to bring up question of B.I. again that promise recorded in our minutes but refused to sign (*word obscured*). But still pressed hard for next 3 years under cry of "liberty of conscience".

1934 (later) G.J. pressed for L.C.G. scheme. All felt it was for purpose of introducing B.I., but G.J. denied it. Later - in 1937 - G.J. admitted was for purpose of making an outlet for B.I. in Elim.

1935 G.J. commenced World Revival Crusade. Later admitted wd not have commenced it if there had been liberty on B.I. in Elim.

1937 Another threat of resignation. Concs. later read to Conf. showing G.J.'s scheme for dividing work into 2 sections, in one of which there wd be liberty on B.I. Otherwise, he wd resign. 1937 Conf Another attempt - but resolution confirmed.

Note: Up to present every disturbance & every threat of resign was on B.I. question. Lay representation or more power for local churches not even mentioned.

1938 Conf. Lay repn with threat of resignation. Turned down as felt another method of introducing B.I. Later, when questioned, G.J. said could not deny B.I. was in his mind when he first proposed lay rep.

"Pattern." Supposed to be open on ? of B.I.

All staff are British Israelites.

First issue made clear that one of objects was to propagate B.I.

Front page every issue: "For the Nation" ("National Message").

"Believers' Commonwealth Fellowship" - stresses "Commonwealth" is

N.T. word. Yes, but only occurrence -

Every issue advertises B.I. books & B.I. meetings or reports them.

Editorial remarks on B.I. discussions are all from B.I. viewpoint.

B.I. sometimes hidden under name "National Historicism".

When issued our first pamphlet & said B.I. behind crisis, not believed. When "Pattern" (BI) issued, people began to believe us.

Latest? G.J. not satisfied with "Mutual Recds". Only now, at last moment raises ? of Suppl. Doctrines.

Says Churches asking for it. Why are they?

Bcs he is prompting the to do so. Why?

I believe undoubtedly for bringing in B.I.

Recently recd unsatisfied letter from member of one of churches

Read it

G.J. by personality could swing scores of churches over to B.I. He knows it.

Hence wants matter decided by local church members.

Note methods:-

First tried influence Executive - failed.

Then Minl. Conf. - brought up in 1934,1935,1937 - failed.

1938 - pressed for laymen.

Now - even before laymen meet tries to take it out of their hands and put in hands of Church members, whom he can influence.

{ Time has come when we shd join hands with other Penl. bodies in opposing this { thing.

A.O.G. & Foursquare in America oppose it.

A.O.G. here also. In fact last week at Conf. A.O.G. rescinded Unity Conf. resolutions because afraid of their assemblies being damaged by either Apostolic practices or B.I. teaching. Seen danger of B.I. coming in thro' "Pattern" & other propaganda.

Most of great Evangelical magazines in America oppose B.I., as well as best evangelical papers here.

B.I. not an ordinary view of prophecy such as Futurism & Historicism. Has an organised movement. The time has come to oppose it.

Our churches, I believe, are waiting for such a move. If we take this stand, do more than anything else to bring back the loyalty of those who have been shaken by the crisis.

Unless deal with this at once, leaven will leaven churches, and few years will become a B.I. movement. Creeping in & in months are closed.

I second motion as feel essential if this Elim movement is to be saved from disaster.

Resolved that in view of P.J.'s recent pamphlet concerning supplementary doctrine we now consider the questions of supplementary doctrine & British Israelism before proceeding with the considerations of the Mutual Recommendations.

Resolved that all questions of doctrine outside the Fundamentals of (*this replaced 'all matters of doctrine arising from'*) the Alliance be decided by the govg body.

Resolved that this Elim Conf of Mins & Laymen while recognising the liberty of every individual to his own convictions on the matter of British Israel, rejects this teaching as a doctrine of the Movement & is opposed to its being taught in any Church of the E.F.G.A. In view of this it is in favour of the resolution of the 1935 Minl Conf on this subject being rescinded.

The motion was carried.

Appendix 3. E.J. Phillips' unpublished hand-written notes presented to the Ministerial Conference in Ireland, 1941

G.J. refused to face this meeting: set impossible conditions (common practice (e.g. with Exec.)).

Challenge: One Scripture for members to appt. minister.
" " " " " decide doctrine.

"Whole ch. to be gov. body": Answer with 3 scriptures.

Under G.J.'s proposals any ch. could walk out into 'Pattern' or any other denom.

Policy to divide a ch. - then make offer to unite it.

'Rev' & clerical collar in Ireland.

B[lackpool], G[lasgow], & K[ensington Temple] cost c.£24,000.

'Pent. Rays' (pp 176 & 192) says the pattern for Ch Govt is in the N.T. Then considered central govt. was the pattern (pub. 1933).

Duplicated leaflet - should have added re. WRC being secret.

'Pattern Practices'

One who was dismissed from Elim for serious moral offence was immediately accepted into 'Pattern' work.

One asked to leave Elim because not living with wife is often on their platforms and prays.

One asked to leave Elim bcs attitude to opposite sex was immediately accepted as a 'Pattern' minister.

Inconsistency In nos. of cases Mins - appt, to chs w/out invitation from that ch. (K, G, Barnsley, Blackpool).

When wants a decision his own way in a ch. brings a crowd in from another ch. & allows then to vote (e.g. Worthing).

Unitarianism & Ult. Reconc.

Secrecy: WRC const & a/cs. Pattern Fell a/cs.

Dictatorship: WRC

Executive - more power than Elim's.

Pretending to make peace while engendering strife.

G.J.'s methods

Founder has become wrecker. Trying to smash up Elim Mvt & build another from wreckage. Failed to smash work other side of water; now trying here in Ireland.

Deliberate use of power of personality. No-one else trying to put over such views would have been heard. We partly to blame for making him the idol of

the Elim people: insisted on always being made much of, demanded photo in every Evangel, & healings thro' other Pastors in small type. Stopped campaigns when reached point of success. Often wrote up his own meetings and praise of himself. He had final word in those days.

GJ knows the power of his personality & builds up the whole of his methods on it.

(Never happy unless in absolute control)

Bibliography

1. Unpublished Materials

Letters

Correspondence was entered into with the following people:

J.T. Bradley to author	1 April 1993
	12 May 1993
	15 October 1993
	21 October 1993
	3 November 1993
G. Canty to author	1 March 1993
	26 May 1993
D. Cartwright to author	3 July 1995
	13 January 1997
	16 June 1997
A.W. Edsor to author	9 September 1996
	20 September 1996
	17 October 1996
W. Hollenweger to author	10 November 1997
J. Lancaster to author	18 January 1994
M. Phillips to author	9 September 1996
T.W. Walker to author	16 February 1993
	25 September 1996
	27 November 1996

The following letters were also used. The originals are kept at the Donald Gee Centre, Mattersey Hall, Rotherham.

Executive Council to Church Officers	9 January 1940
to Conference Members	9 August 1940
to diaconates	23 August 1940
Ministerial Circulars	13 October 1936
	30 October 1937
	31 December 1937
	1 January 1938
	23 March 1939
	20 December 1939
	3 January 1940
	4 January 1940
	3 January 1941
	30 January 1941
	20 February 1941
	14 March 1941
	18 June 1942
	29 March 1943
	15 April 1943
E.C.W. Boulton to W.G. Hathaway	3 August 1937
	17 February 1939
to E.J. Phillips	30 November 1925
	16 February 1926

	30 December 1926
J.T. Bradley to E.J. Phillips	5 October 1941
P.S. Brewster to E.J. Phillips	27 May 1946
	31 August 1950
	10 February 1953
G. Canty to E.J. Phillips	14 November 1945
to K. Warrington	25 November 1996
F.G. Cloke to Executive Council	15 October 1943
D. Du Plessis to E.J. Phillips	30 July 1944
J. Dyke to W.G. Hathaway	5 February 1937
H.W. Greenway to E.J. Phillips	6 August 1941
to Members of Conference	26 October 1962
W.G. Hathaway to P.S. Brewster	18 January 1947
to Executive Council	17 October 1939
to J. Dyke	5 February 1937
to G. Jeffreys	3 June 1936
	15 June 1938
	12 July 1938
	29 August 1939
to E.J. Phillips	19 November 1937
	13 December 1937
	13 September 1939
	10 October 1939
	16 October 1939

	18 October 1939
	11 March 1942
	12 March 1942
	18 March 1942
	21 June 1942
	28 November 1942
	30 December 1942
	5 January 1943
	19 August 1943
	27 August 1943
	31 August 1943
	1 September 1943
	5 April 1944
	3 May 1944
to ministers	30 October 1937
	17 May 1940
W. Henderson to E.J. Phillips	19 July 1924
	12 November 1925
	6 December 1928
	26 December 1928
G. Jeffreys to all members in Elim	January 1940
to diaconates	15 August 1940
	29 August 1940
	December 1940

	12 June 1942
to Executive Council	1 August 1938
	16 August 1938
	12 November 1940
	21 February 1958
to W.G. Hathaway	28 April 1938
	7 June 1938
	14 June 1938
	24 April 1939
	6 August 1939
to W. Henderson	7 March 1925
	26 August 1925
	21 October 1925
	30 October 1925
to J. Macdonald	9 May 1935
to ministers	5 August 1938
to B. Sandwith	27 February 1942
to E.J. Phillips	undated
	11 February 1925
	28 September 1928
	15 October 1933
	18 October 1933
	23 October 1933
	26 October 1933

1 December 1934
4 December 1934
1 November 1935
11 February 1935
28 August 1935
1 November 1935
18 November 1935
19 March 1936
9 September 1936
15 December 1936
15 January 1937
26 January 1937
28 January 1937
10 February 1937
15 February 1937
1 March 1937
27 June 1937
30 June 1937
9 September 1938
9 November 1938
11 January 1939
18 January 1939
10 February 1939
24 April 1939

C. Kingston to W.G. Hathaway	29 March 1943
J. McWhirter to J. Du Plessis	9 December 1975
W.R. Mercer to D. Green	6 January 1986
M. Mullen to A.W. Edsor	23 October 1996
Pastor and Deacons of Nottingham Church to Exective Council	18 December 1939
Pastor and Deacons of Elim Tabernacle, Graham Street, Birmingham to Exective Council	16 January 1940
Pastor and Deacons of Brixton Elim Church to Executive Council	12 September 1940
E.J. Phillips to P.S. Brewster	9 February 1953
to Elim ministers	18 January 1940
to Executive Council	10 December 1936
	4 October 1937
	7 September 1937
	27 October 1939
to W.G. Hathaway	13 November 1937
	22 November 1937
	12 September 1939
	14 September 1939
	15 September 1939
	26 September 1939
	17 October 1939
	26 October 1939

	7 November 1939
	1 March 1941
	5 January 1942
	16 March 1942
	2 January 1943
	25 February 1943
	16 March 1943
	28 September 1943
	17 October 1943
	22 October 1943
	4 May 1944
	5 May 1944
	23 November 1944
to G. Jeffreys	17 October 1933
	20 October 1933
	25 October 1933
	3 December 1934
	30 January 1935
	7 May 1935
	24 May 1935
	31 May 1935
	19 November 1935
	4 November 1936
	30 December 1936

	25 January 1937
	26 January 1937
	1 February 1937
	8 February 1937
	13 February 1937
	16 February 1937
	19 February 1937
	23 February 1937
	3 March 1937
	29 June 1937
	7 September 1937
	21 June 1938
	29 June 1938
	11 November 1938
	4 January 1939
	9 August 1939
	14 March 1940
to P.G. Parker	10 March 1939
to B. Sandwith	29 February 1942
	5 March 1942
M. Phillips to Elim ministers	14 April 1943
Rugeley Church Leaders to Executive Council	19 August 1940
B. Sandwith to G. Jeffreys	24 February 1942
B. Sandwith to E.J. Phillips	24 February 1942

2 March 1942

25 March 1942

J. Smith to E.J. Phillips

11 August 1941

Interviews

These were held with the following people:

G. Canty	21 April 1993, Bognor Regis.
	24 May 1993, Birmingham.
D. Cartwright	13 November 1995, Sheffield.
	24 May 1996 (Telephone).
	11 June 1997 (Telephone).
A. W. Edsor	23 October 1996, London.
G.W. Gilpin	21 April 1993, Bognor Regis.
J.C. Kennedy	22 April 1993, Bognor Regis.
J. Lancaster	20 April 1993, Bognor Regis.
M. Phillips	4 March 1997, Birkenhead.
M. Stormont	6 February 1998, Nantwich.

Unpublished Papers

Conference Minutes from 1932-1945.

Minutes - Unofficial Executive Council Meeting Minutes 12 March 1937

Questionnaire to Irish Churches c. 20 November 1935

Questionnaire to Executive Council re. Lay Representation 1938

Transcription of message in tongues and interpretation given at the day

of prayer for ministers at Elim Woodlands 6 February 1940

Transcription of message in tongues and interpretation given to

ministers gathered at Elim Bible College 4 March 1941

Official report of Pentecostal Unity Conference 24-25 August 1948

Report of the Committee set up to consider a revision of the Statement

of Fundamental Beliefs 1993

Elim Conference Reports: 1994

Regionalisation Discussion paper circulated to Conference members,

January 1995

Elim Conference Reports 1995

Tape of the Discussion, Elim Conference, Wednesday 24 May 1995

Allen, D. Signs and Wonders: Origins, Growth and Development and

Significance of the Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland,

1900-1980.

Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1990

Boddy, J. Vazeille Alexander Alfred Boddy, 1854-1930 n.d.

Brewster, P.S. Personal Memoirs Regents Theological College Archive, n.d.

Canty, G. By My Spirit: History of Elim 1983

Cartwright, D. Elim: A Short History n.d.

Unpublished Notes n.d.

- Evans, W. Notes to the church membership at Hendon on Elim and its progress February 1940
- Hathaway, W.G. Untitled manuscripts re. crisis in 1939.
- Jeffreys, G. Statement presented to Ministerial Conference
12 September 1938
- Notes of a speech given at Ministerial Conference November 1939
- Kay, W. A History of the British Assemblies of God Ph D. diss., University of Birmingham, 1989
- Ladlow, G. Memoirs of 6 June 1944 Regents Theological College Archive,
31 January 1983
- Lewis, I.W. Discussion Document regarding proposed revisions to the Constitution 1994
- Llewellyn, H.B. A Study in the History and Thought of the Apostolic Church in Wales in the Context of Pentecostalism M.Phil. diss., University of Bangor, 1997
- Massey, R. 'A Sound and Scriptural Union.' An Examination of the Origins of the Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland during the years 1920-25. Ph D. diss., University of Birmingham, 1988
- Parker, P.G. Report of the Nottingham Conference held at the City Temple, Halifax, on behalf of Bible Pattern Church Fellowship 1940
- Phillips, E.J. Handwritten notes for the Coming of Age Celebration in the Royal Albert Hall 1936
- Notes of Executive Council meeting 17 February 1937
- Notes of the speech given at Ministerial Conference 21 November 1939

- Some Questions - speech n.d.
- Draft reply to W. Hollenweger n.d
- Robinson, M. The Life and Ministry of A.A. Boddy n.d.
- Ross, B.R. Donald Gee: A Sectarian in Search of a Church D.Th. diss.,
Toronto: Knox College, 1974
- Taylor, M.J. Publish and Be Blessed Ph. D. diss., University of Birmingham,
1994
- Tweed, R. Notes of debate Conference 1939 Mattersey Hall Archive
- Ward, J. Questionnaire sent to 42 ministers Regents Theological College
Archive, 1977
- Walker, T.W. Paper given to the Conference of District Superintendents,
Headquarters' Officers and Executive Council Members
16 March 1981

2. Published material

Pamphlets

These are listed in chronological order. Some of them were dated, where that is the case the dates have been included. Others were undated and their position has been determined on the basis of content and information gleaned from correspondence. Publishing details were not included generally. Elim's pamphlets were printed at the Publishing Company. Jeffreys used various printing firms in London. Elim's often were anonymous publications.

The Foursquare Gospel Testimony (London: Elim Publishing co., n.d.)

Jeffreys, G. *Why I Resigned from the Elim Movement*, December 1939.

Elim, *A Reply to the Pamphlet by the Principal George Jeffreys entitled Why I Resigned from the Elim Movement*, December 1939.

Jeffreys, G. *The Pattern*, November 1939

Parker, P.G. *Another Reply*. n.d.

Executive Council, *A Basis for Unity in Elim*, January 1940.

Elim, *Unity in Elim*, February 1940.

Elim, *Elim and Principal George Jeffreys*, January 1941.

Elim, *The Kensington Temple, London*, 1941.

Jeffreys, G., *Why I am outside Elim*, March 1941.

Jeffreys, G., *The Magna Charter of the Christian Church*, May 1941.

Elim, *Where Elim Stands*, 23 May 1941.

Elim, *Where Elim Stands No. 2*, 27 June 1941.

Elim, *Where Elim Stands No. 3*, 22 August 1941.

Jeffreys, G., *What is Elim's New Constitution?* August 1941.

Elim, *Should a Christian Go To Law?*

Jeffreys, G., *The Church or the Law, Which?* 1941.

Elim, *Declaration* by the Elim Conference 1941.

Jeffreys, G., *Elim Church Property*, 12 June 1942 sent to Diaconates.

Elim, *What Does Mr Jeffreys Believe?* n.d.

Elim, *Worthing and Elim*. n.d.

Jeffreys, G., *The Elim Headquarters and the Worthing Church* n.d.

Jeffreys, G., *The Rights of the Local Church*. n.d.

Elim, *Elim and Portsmouth*. n.d.

Jeffreys, G., *A Church Congregation Forced to the Road in Wartime*. n.d.

Jeffreys, G., *A Disgraceful Document*, 30 June 1942.

Jeffreys, G., *An Embrasive Policy for Elim*. n.d.

Jeffreys, G., *Elim's New Constitution*. n.d.

Jeffreys, G., *The Rights of the Local Church*. n.d.

Jeffreys, G., *Elim's New Constitution in the Light of Scriptural Principles*. n.d.

Jeffreys, G., *The Glasgow City Temple - A Just Claim* 1 January 1943 .

Jeffreys, G., *The Elim System of Government - A Biblical or Babylonish*,
February 1943.

Jeffreys, G., *Babylon in Organised Religion* December 1943.

Jeffreys, G., *Fight for the Faith and Freedom*, May 1944.

Jeffreys, G., *A Serious Challenge*, 29 May 1945.

Jeffreys, G., *A Challenge Now Before the Elim Conference*, 1945.

Jeffreys, G., *A Statement to Elim Churches in Ireland*, October 1945.

Jeffreys, G., *A Significant Request by Irish Elim Conference*, July 1946.

Jeffreys, G., *Four Church Congregations Appeal to the Elim Conference*,
October 1946.

Jeffreys, G., *Assemblies of God and Bible Pattern Church Fellowship*, 1948.

Jeffreys, G. *Bible Prophecy in Evangelism*, April 1958.

Articles

Confidence Magazine

"Revival at Plymouth: Two Reports" May 1915, 81

"Elim Mission Newsletter" May 1916, 81-82

"The Pentecostal Missionary Union" October-December 1918, 71

Barratt, T.B. "The Baptism in the Holy Ghost - What is it?"

October 1909, 221-222

"An Urgent Plea for Charity and Unity" February 1911, 31

"An Urgent Plea for Charity and Unity" (Cont.) March 1911, 64

"Tongues in the Public Assembly" December 1914, 233-236

Boddy, A.A. "Tongues as a seal of Pentecost" April 1908, 18

"At Keswick" August 1908, 13

"The Conference in Germany" January 1909, 6

"Editor's Report of the First Meeting on the Second Day"

August 1909, 179

"Tongues: The Pentecostal Sign; Love, the evidence of
continuance"

November 1910, 261

"An Apostolic Welsh Revival"

February 1913, 27-29

"The Welsh Revivalists Visited"	March 1913, 47-49
"News"	March-April 1917, 20
Darragh, R.E. "Elim Mission Convention"	May 1916, 81-82
"The Ballymena Convention"	March-April 1917, 19-20
Hackett, T.E. "Pentecostal Meetings in Belfast"	April-June 1918, 19 -21
"A Remedy for Ireland's Troubles"	July-Sept 1918, 53-55
Hare, E.W. "Pentecostal Tabernacle at Belfast"	October-December 1919, 59,62
Jeffreys, G. "Revival at Plymouth: Letter to Rev. Boddy"	May 1915, 89
"Revival in Ireland"	August 1916, 130-131
Jeffreys, T.M. "Sunderland International Pentecostal Congress"	June 1909, 135
Polman, G. "The Place of Tongues in the Pentecostal Movement"	August 1911, 177

Elim Evangel

"Revival in a Theological College"	September 1920, 64
"Pentecostal Preachers Draw the Multitudes"	June 1922, 87
"Items of Interest"	July 1922, 108
"Items of Interest"	March 1923, 38
"Elim Evangelistic Band"	August 1923, 168
"List of Members"	January 1925, 11
"Calling for George Jeffreys"	15 June 1926, 142
"Items of Interest"	1 July 1926, 154-155
"God's Mighty Deliverance"	1 February 1927, 41
"The Foursquare Gospel Testimony"	1 October 1927, 293

Editorial	12 July 1929, 168
"Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance"	25 December 1929, 547
"Concise Comments and Interesting Items"	27 June 1930, 408
Editorial	15 August 1930, 520
"Snappers who were snapped for Christ"	5 February 1932, 86
"Concise Comments and Interesting Items"	2 December 1932, 780
Editorial	31 August 1934, 549
"Evolution, Higher Criticism and Modernism"	5 October 1934, 627
Editorial: "Is Principal George Jeffreys Rich?"	28 June 1935, 410
Editorial: "Jubilee Appeal Fund"	30 August 1935, 554
"The World Revival Crusade"	14 February 1936, 99
"Jubilee Stamps"	12 June 1936, 382
Editorial: "A Week of Prayer"	25 September 1936, 618
"Elim Jubilee Fund"	27 November 1936, ii
"A Final Appeal"	25 December 1936, 821
"What our Readers say"	19 February 1937, 124
"What our Readers say"	2 March 1937, 172
"The Ministerial Conference of 1937"	15 October 1937, 667-668
Editorial	1 July 1938, 410
"George Jeffreys and his Revival Party"	25 December 1938, 802
"Unity in Elim"	15 March 1940, 170
"A Touch from God at the Conference"	
	5 June 1944, 178-179, 182-183
Editorial	6 November 1965, 710

Editorial	15 September 1973, 2
Barbour, M. "A Mighty Enduement"	19 June 1936, 394
Benson, C.H. "Modern Astronomy Confirms the Bible"	
	3 December 1937, 776-777, 784
Boulton, E.C.W. "Pentecost"	October 1923, 202
"Elim's Coming of Age"	23 August 1935, 538
"The Foursquare Gospel Movement and Fundamentalism"	
	7 February 1936, 81-82
"The Manifold Ministry of the Holy Ghost"	12 June 1944, 189-190
Bradley, J.T. "Modernism, or the Present Revolution"	17 May 1935, 307-309
"Review of <u>The Pentecostals</u> by W. Hollenweger"	20 May 1972, 9
Brewster, P.S. "The Wigan Campaign - Eight Months After"	4 February 1944, 56
"Lewi Pethrus now with the Lord"	28 September 1974, 7
Burton, W.F. "The Baptism in the Holy Ghost"	December 1922, 184-188
Canty, G. "The Past, What Past?"	6 November 1965, 721
Cartwright, D. "A New Year, A New Look"	3 January 1976, 8
"Pentecost in Britain"	25 September 1976, 8-9
"Echoes from the Past"	22 January 1983, 6-7
"Echoes from the Past"	29 January 1983, 6-7
Coates, C.A. "The Nineteenth Century of Pentecost"	23 May 1930, 321-323
Connors, F.A. "Verbal Inspiration of the Scriptures"	4 November 1932, 707-709
Corry, P.N.C. "The Evolutionary Bridge - Can it stand?"	19 January 1934, 33-34
"Remember the Jubilee Appeal Fund this Christmas"	
	25 December 1935, 825

	"Baptised into Reality"	19 June 1936, 391
Cunningham, V.	"Sociology and Pentecost"	22 July 1972, 12-13
Davis, J.	"The Welsh Revival"	9 December 1932, 769-771
Edsor, A.W.	"The Scottish Convention: Memorable Revival Scenes"	27 January 1933, 61
	"Principal and Party at Colwyn Bay, Revival Blessing"	1 July 1938, 410
Finney, C.	"The Need of Revival"	15 November 1927, 337-338
Gee, D.	"To Seekers after the Baptism in the Holy Ghost"	April 1923, 64-66
	"To Seekers after the Baptism in the Holy Ghost" (Cont.)	May 1923, 87-89
	"To Seekers after the Baptism in the Holy Ghost" (Reprinted)	18 April 1970, 260-261
Gorman, S.	"Personality Spotlight"	25 December 1957, 810
Gray, J.	"The Bible's Testimony to its own Inspiration"	8 July 1938, 424-425
Greenway, H.W.	"Has Modernism Overthrown Fundamentalism"	7 February 1936, 88-89, 92
	"Syncopated Christianity"	11 December 1936, 787
	"The Elim Conference"	24 June 1946, 291-297, 305-306
	"Homecall of Pastor R.E. Darragh"	28 March 1959, 199
	"Well done ... faithful servant"	22 September 1973, 3
Hardman, J.	"Can we expect Revival in these Days?"	6 January 1941, 8-9, 12
	"Another Milestone Passed"	5 June 1944, 184

Hare, E.W.	"Ultimate Reconciliation Examined"	May 1924, 106-108
Hathaway, W.G.	"Secretarial Notes"	25 February 1937, 122
	"Elim's Policy of Pioneer Evangelism"	8 August 1946, 321
Henderson, A.	"Possessed and Permeated by God"	19 June 1936, 391
Herrstrom, W.D.	"Why the Bible Cannot be Destroyed"	12 July 1935, 443-444
Ironsides, H.A.	"May we Expect Revival in Britain before the Coming of Christ?"	15 March 1935, 168-169, 172
Jeffreys, G.	"A Prophetic Vision Fulfilled, or How the Elim Work in Ireland Began"	December 1921, 6
	"Pentecostalism in Scandinavia"	October 1923, 214
	"A Striking Analogy"	16 February 1925, 37-38
	"The Spirit of Christ and the Holy Spirit"	16 March 1925, 61-64
	"A Tribute to Sister McPherson"	1 June 1926, 122
	"Christmas and New Year's Greetings"	25 December 1929, 529-530
	"Christmas and New Year's Greetings"	25 December 1930, 801-802
	"Christmas and New Year's Greetings"	25 December 1932, 817-818
	"Christmas and New Year's Greetings"	25 December 1933, 801-802
	"Sanctification: Conclusion of a Sermon preached at the City Temple, London"	19 October 1934, 656-657

"Christmas and New Year's Greetings"	25 December 1934, 801-802
"What is the World Revival Crusade?"	14 February 1936, 99
"Christmas 1915-1936"	25 December 1936, 801-802
"A Momentous Day in History"	7 May 1937, 296-297
"A Call to Prayer and Sacrifice"	24 December 1937, 817-818
"God Answers Prayer"	29 April 1938, 267
"God Answers Prayer"	6 May 1938, 282
"God Answers Prayer"	13 May 1938, 289
"God Answers Prayer"	2 September 1938, 555
"God Answers Prayer"	24 March 1939, 187
"The Principal and His Revival Party"	25 December 1938, 802
Kingston, C.J.E. "The Coming of Christ and After"	16 November 1925, 253 - 255
"Mrs Aimee Semple McPherson in London"	15 March 1926, 61-64
"The Revival we need"	2 April 1945, 107
Kortkamp, A.W. "A Bible study on the Baptism of the Holy Spirit"	August 1922, 128
Lancaster, J. "Review of <u>Restoring the Kingdom</u> by A. Walker"	7 December 1985, 4
Lavender, F. "New Wine, New Wineskins"	25 October 1975, 8
Lees, J. "Another Comforter"	19 July 1929, 180-181
McAlister, R.E. "The Pentecostal Movement"	January 1923, 16
"The Supernatural"	26 November 1937, 764-765

McClain, J.	"Interesting Scientific Accuracies in the Bible"	11 June 1937, 376-377, 380-381
McQuilken, R.	"May we Expect Revival Today"	27 January 1941, 59-60
McWhirter, J.	"Pentecost"	2 March 1934, 136
	"Beyond Compare"	19 June 1936, 395
Mason, H.A.	"The Believer's Attitude in a Pleasure-loving Age"	5 October 1934, 636
Myerscough, T.	"The Epistle to the Assembly at Rome: The Holy Spirit and the Spirit of Christ"	July 1924, 156-160
Parker, P.G.	"The Fundamentalists' Cry"	7 February 1936, 83-85
	"Why I do not ..."	17 July 1936, 451-452
Parsons, P.	"Focus on Tamworth"	12 July 1975, 4-5
Phillips, E.J.	"Elim Jubilee Fund"	24 January 1936, 59
	"A Spiritual Revolution"	19 June 1936, 396
	"Tribute to one of Britain's Greatest Evangelist"	17 February 1962, 104
	"A Notable Jubilee"	15 November 1969, 765
Phillips, F.B.	Letter	16 August 1975, 5
Pierce, E.V.	"Why I am a Fundamentalist"	24 February 1933, 116-118
Price, G.M.	"Gaps in the Evolution Theory"	17 February 1933, 105-106
Proctor, H.	"Elim Tabernacle, Clapham"	February 1923, 25
	"Elim"	15 December 1925, 288
Riley, W.B.	"The 'Days' of Creation"	4 March 1932, 153-156
Rimmer, H.	"The 'Days' of Creation"	11 March 1932, 161-166

Rowell, J.B. "The Great Gulf Fixed"	14 February 1936, 104-105, 110
Semple McPherson, A. "Kidnapped"	15 September 1926, 206-216
"God's Mighty Deliverance"	1 December 1927, 41-43
Smith, J. "What is the Difference between the Holy Spirit and the Spirit of Christ"	22 April 1938, 256
"The Inspiration of the Bible"	24 June 1938, 385-387
"A Loving Tribute to Mr George Gillespie"	2 June 1947, 307
"He Never Shirked any Duty"	22 September 1973, 4
Stevenson, T.H. "From T.H. Stevenson"	3 July 1971, 14
Strachan, J.S. "I Remember"	20 November 1965, 757
Tweed, R. "The Personality and Baptism of the Holy Spirit"	2 March 1934, 140
Williams, J. "What is a Revival?"	4 July 1930, 425-427
Winrod, G.B. "Evolution: Unscientific, Atheistic, Immoral"	3 June 1938, 344-345
"Evolution: Unscientific, Atheistic, Immoral" (Cont.)	10 June 1938, 353-355
Whitney, D.J. "The Problem of Early Man"	9 September 1932, 577-579
Woodhead, J. "Fundamentalism Vs Modernism"	25 February 1938, 123-124
Wright, G. "Is the 'New' Really New? Part 4"	26 June 1982, 6-7

Elim Supplement

Boulton, E.C.W. "Letter from America"	October 1924, 47
---------------------------------------	------------------

Foursquare Revivalist Magazine

Editorial: "Why we appear"	3 August 1928, 2
----------------------------	------------------

"Keswick's Continuing Message"	10 August 1928, 1
Editorial: "A Great Woman's Tribulation"	14 September 1928, 4
"Great American Tribute to Sister McPherson"	21 September 1928, 1
"Close of a Triumphant Week in London"	19 October 1928, 1
"Closing days of a Great Campaign"	16 November 1928, 1
Denney, J.B. "The Real Perjurers Unmasked"	5 October 1928, 6

The Pattern Magazine

"Contributions"	April 1962, 40
Edsor, A.W. "Holy Ghost Revival at Bradford"	August 1941, 1
"The Nine Points of Dr Lewi Pethrus"	April 1962, 26-28
Francis, G.I. "Three Powerful Easter Monday Meetings"	May 1959, 8
Jeffreys, G. "A Crying Need"	January 1940, 1
"My Attitude towards the Prophetic Schools"	January 1940, 6-8
"The Unity Conference"	February 1941, 6-7
"George Jeffreys comments on the Unity Conference"	February 1941, 7
"Since the Elim Conference of May 1940"	August 1940, 3
"The Church or the Law - Which?"	November 1941, 2-3
Macmillan, D. "The Take-over Techniques in Modern Church History	
Transition from Charisma to Legalism"	October 1961
Naumann, L. "Letter to Elim and George Jeffreys"	October 1941, 6-7

Miscellaneous Articles

- "Opening of Elim Gospel Mission" Lytham Times, 16 January 1914
- "A Statement of Fundamental Truths approved by the General
Presbytery of the Assemblies of God of Great Britain and Ireland"
Redemption Tidings July 1924, 19
- "John Leech" National Message and Banner 18 September 1926, 180
- Atkinson, W.P. "Pentecostal Responses to Dunn's *Baptism in the Spirit*:
Luke-Acts" Journal of Pentecostal Theology 6, 1995, 87-131
- "Pentecostal Responses to Dunn's *Baptism in the Spirit*: Pauline
Letters" Journal of Pentecostal Theology 7, 1995, 49-72
- Black, H.B. "Review of *Set Your House in Order*"
EPTA Bulletin 8:4, 1989, 180-183
- Blumhofer, E.L. "Alexander Boddy and the Rise of Pentecostalism"
Pneuma 8:1, 1986, 31-40
- Bundy, D. "Review of *Guds eld over Sverige Svensk Vachelsehistoria efter
1945, T. Aronson*" Pneuma 15:2, Fall 1993, 223-225
- "Lewi Pethrus" Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic
Movements, 711-714
- Burton, W.F.P. "My testimony to the Baptism in the Holy Spirit"
Redemption Tidings April, 1930, 3-4
- Bush, T.A.C. "The Development of the Perception of the Baptism in the Holy
Spirit within the Pentecostal Movement in Great Britain"
EPTA Bulletin 10:1&2, 1992, 24-41
- Coates, J.R. "Cults Today" Expository Times 54:12, September 1943, 313-315

- Gee, D. "Attitudes towards the Supernatural" Pentecost December 1956, 17
- "George Jeffreys" Pentecost March-May, 1962, 11
- "Lewi Pethrus - 80 years old" Pentecost June-August, 1964, 6
- Hathaway, M. "The role of William Oliver Hutchinson and the Apostolic Faith Church in the formation of British Pentecostal Churches" EPTA Bulletin 16, 1996, 40-51
- Hocken, P. "European Pentecostalism" Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 268-278
- Hollenweger, W. "Creator Spiritus: The Challenge of Pentecostal Experience to Pentecostal Theology" Theology January 1978, 32-40
- Hyamson, A.M. "The Lost Tribes and the Influence of the Search for them on the Return of the Jews to England" Jewish Quarterly Review 15, 1903, 640-676
- Lindberg, A. "The Swedish Pentecostal Movement: Some Ideological Features" EPTA Bulletin 6:2, 1987, 40-46
- Lloyd, A. "George Jeffreys" Picture Post, 11 May, 1946, 10-13
- Massey, R. "A Flirtation with Elim: Donald Gee's negotiations to join the Elim Pentecostal Alliance in 1923" EPTA Bulletin 8:1, 1989, 4-13
- Mogridge, H. "My personal testimony to Pentecost" Redemption Tidings June 1930, 6-8
- Myerscough, T. "Letter to W. Hutchinson" Showers of Blessing August-September 1910, 1-2
- Parr, J. Nelson "Homecall of Mr Thomas Myerscough"

Redemption Tidings April 1932, 2

Randall, I.M. "Holiness and Pentecostal Spirituality in Inter-War England"

Papers presented to S.P.S. and EPCRA Conference,

Mattersey Hall, 10-14 July 1995, n.p.

"Old Time Power: Relationships between Pentecostal and
Evangelical Spirituality in England"

Pneuma 19:1, Spring 1997, 53-80

Silverman, G.E. "British Israelism"

Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1382

van der Laan, C. "Review of *The Great Evangelists*"

EPTA Bulletin 5:3, 1986, 98-100

"The Proceedings of the Leaders' Meetings (1908-11) and of the
International Pentecostal Conferences (1912-14)"

EPTA Bulletin 6:3, 1987, 76-96

Zeigler, J.R. "A.C. Valdez" Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic

Movements, 868

Books

- Faith and Freedom Covenant np, nd
- The Constitution of the Foursquare Gospel Churches of Great Britain
(Inc. 1927) np.,nd
- The World Revival Crusade London: Elim Publications Co., nd
- Modifications in Rules for Secretaries and Treasurers (Direct
Government under the Council) for Ireland
London: Elim Publishing Co., 1936
- The Constitution of the Bible Pattern Church Fellowship, 1941
- Anglo-Jewish Notabilities Jewish Historical Society of England.
London: University College, 1955
- The Universal Home Doctor London: Odhams Press, 1935
- The Constitution of the Elim Pentecostal Church (Elim Foursquare
Gospel Alliance) Cheltenham: Elim Publishing Co., 1994
- Adams, A. Stephen Jeffreys London: Covenant Publishing Co., 1928
- Atter, G.F. The Third Force Peterborough, Ontario: College Press, 1970³
- Barabas, S. So Great a Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick
Convention London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1952
- Barclay, O. Evangelicalism in Britain, 1935-1995 Leicester: I.V.P., 1995
- Bardon, J. A History of Ulster Belfast: The Black Staff Press, 1992
- Baron, D. The History of the Ten 'Lost' Tribes: Anglo-Israelism Examined
London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1915
- Barratt, T.B. In the Days of the Latter Rain London: Elim Publishing Co., 1928

- Bebbington, D. Evangelicalism in Modern Britain London: Unwin Hyman, 1989
- Bloch-Hoell, N. The Pentecostal Movement London: Allen & Unwin, 1964
- Blumhofer, E.L. The Assemblies of God
 Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1989
- Everybody's Sister Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993
- Boulton, E.C.W. Ministry of the Miraculous London: Elim Publishing Co., 1928
- Bradley, J.T. (ed) Elim Lay Preacher's Handbook
 London: Elim Publishing Co., 1946
- Branson, N. Britain in the Nineteen Twenties
 London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1995
- Brewster, P.S. (ed) Pentecostal Doctrine
 Cheltenham: Grenehurst Press, 1976
- Brooks, N. Fight for the Faith and Freedom London: The Pattern Bookroom, n.d.
- Burgess, S.M., McGee, G., Alexander, P.,
Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements
 Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988
- Canty, G. In My Father's House London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1969
- Carter, J. A Full Life London: Evangel Press, 1979
- Cartwright, D. The Great Evangelists Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering, 1986
- Currie, R., Gilbert, A., Horsley, L.
Churches and Churchgoers Oxford: OUP, 1977
- Darragh, R.E. In Defence of His Word London: Elim Publishing Co., 1932
- Davies, H. Christian Deviations London: SCM, 1954
- Dawson, L. Cults in Context Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press, 1996

Du Plessis, J. The Life of Andrew Murray of South Africa

London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1919

Edsor, A.W. George Jeffreys: Man of God

London: Ludgate Press, 1964

In Defence of a Man of God falsely portrayed: An Open Letter to
ministers and peoples of the Elim Movement, the Assemblies of
God and the Bible Pattern Fellowship 25 July, 1986

Gloucester: Garamond Original

'Set Your House in Order'. God's Call to George Jeffreys as the
Founder of the Elim Pentecostal Church

Chichester: New Wine Press, 1989

Epstein, D.M. Sister Aimee: The Life of Aimee Semple McPherson

Orlanda, Fl: D.M. Epstein, 1993

Epstein, I. Babylonian Talmud

London: The Soncino Press, 1935

Evans, E. The Welsh Revival of 1904

London: Evangelical Press, 1969

Fraser, M. Sir Lionel Phillips Parktown, South Africa: Parktown and Westcliff

Heritage Trust, 1988

Frodsham, S.H. With Signs Following

Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1946

Gee, D. Upon All Flesh

Grand Rapids: Gospel Publishing House, 1935

The Pentecostal Movement

London: Elim Publishing Co., 1941

Wind and Flame

Croydon: Heath Press, 1967

These Men I Knew

Nottingham: Assemblies of God, 1980

- Goff, J.R. "Fields White unto Harvest"; Charles F. Parham and the
Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism
Fayette and London: University of Arkansas Press, 1980
- Graves, R. and Hodge, A. The Long Weekend: A Social History of Great
Britain, 1918-1939 London: Sphere Books, 1991
- Greenway, H.W. The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit
London: Elim Pentecostal Church, n.d.
- Grenville, J.A.S Collins History of the World in the Twentieth Century
London: Harper Collins, 1994
- Hastings, A. A History of English Christianity, 1920-90 London: SCM, 1991³
- Hathaway, W.G. Spiritual Gifts in the Church London: Elim Publishing Co., 1933
- Sound from Heaven London: Victory Press, 1947
- Heiler, F. The Gospel of Sadhu Sundar Singh E.T.: London: Allen & Unwin, 1927
- Henderson, W. Church Ministry and Organisation London: Victory Press, 1931
- Hollenweger, W. The Pentecostals Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988 [1972]
- Pentecostalism Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997
- Hopkins, E.H. The Law of Liberty in the Spiritual Life
London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, n.d.
- Horton, H. The Gifts of the Spirit London: Assemblies of God, 1949³
- Inge, W.R. Lay Thoughts of a Dean London: Hutchinson & Co., 1926
- Jeffreys, E. Stephen Jeffreys: The Beloved Evangelist
London: Elim Publishing Co., 1946
- Jeffreys, G. The Constitution of the Elim Pentecostal Alliance
London: Battley Bros., 1922

The Miraculous Foursquare Gospel, Vol. 1

London: Elim Publishing Co., 1929

Healing Rays

London: Elim Publishing Co., 1932

Pentecostal Rays

London: Elim Publishing Co., 1933

Constitution of the Bible Pattern Church Fellowship

n.p., 1955

The Faith and Freedom Covenant

n.p., n.d.

Josephus (trans. Marcus, R. and Wikgren, A.)

Antiquities of the Jews

London: Heinemann, 1980

Kay, W. Inside Story

Mattersey: Mattersey Hall Publishing, 1990

Keegan, J. The Mask of Command

London: Penguin, 1987

Kent, J. Holding the Fort

London: Epworth, 1978

Kingston, C.J.E. Fullness of Power

London: Elim Publishing Co., 1939

Lancaster, J. The Spirit Filled Church

Cheltenham: Grenehurst Press, 1976

Landau, R. God is my Adventure

London: Faber & Faber, 1942²

Latourette, K.S. The Twentieth Century in Europe, Vol. IV

Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1969

Lederle, H.I. Treasures Old and New

Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988

Lloyd, R. The Church of England, 1900-65

London: SCM, 1966

Marsden, G.M. Fundamentalism and American Culture

New York: O.U.P., 1982

Martin, D. Tongues of Fire

Oxford: Blackwell, 1993

Forbidden Revolutions

London: SPCK, 1996

McMillan, J. The Way it was, 1914-34

London: William Kimber, 1979

McWhirter, J. Britain and Palestine in Prophecy

London: Methuen & Co., 1937

Every Barrier Swept Away

Cardiff: Megiddo Press, 1983

- Missen, A. The Sound of a Going Nottingham: Assemblies of God, 1973
- Nichol, J.T. The Pentecostals Plainfield, N.J. : Logos, 1966
- Oliver, J. The Church and Social Order London: Mowbray, 1968
- Orr, J.E. Evangelical Awakenings: 1900-75 Chicago: Moody Press, 1975
- Packer, J.I. Keep in Step with the Spirit Leicester: I.V.P., 1988²
- Parham, C. A Voice Crying in the Wilderness n.p., 1902
- Parker, P.G. The Baptism in the Holy Spirit London: Elim Publishing Co., n.d.
- Parsons, G. Religion in Victorian Britain: Traditions Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988
- Peacock, H.L. A History of Modern Britain, 1915-79 London: Heinemann, 1980⁴
- Penn-Lewis, J. The Awakening in Wales London: Overcomer Literature Trust, nd
- Pethrus, L. (trans. H. Lindblom) The Wind Bloweth where it Listeth
Chicago: Filadelfia Book Co., 1938
- Phillips, D.M. Evan Roberts The Great Welsh Revivalist and His Work
London: Marshall Bros, 1906
- Pollock, A.J. 'The British Israel Theory' briefly tested by Scripture
London: Central Truth Depot, n.d.
- Pollock, J.C. The Cambridge Seven London: I.V.P., 1959
- The Keswick Story London: Hodder, 1964
- Priestley, J.B. The Good Companions Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962 [1929]
- English Journey Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977 [1934]
- Redwood, H. God in the Slums London: Hodder & Stoughton, n.d.
- Robertson, R. Sociology of Religion Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969
- Rose, J. Marie Stopes and the Sexual Revolution

- London: Faber and Faber, 1992
- Roth, C. (ed.) Encyclopaedia Judaica Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1971
- Sellars, I. Nineteenth Century Nonconformity London: Edward Arnold, 1977
- Stevenson, H.F. Keswick's Authentic Voice: 65 Dynamic Addresses delivered at the Keswick Convention, 1875-1957
London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1959
- Keswick's Triumphant Voice: 48 Outstanding Addresses delivered at the Keswick Convention, 1882-1962
London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1963
- Synan, V. Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins
Plainfield, N.J.: Logos, 1975
- Taylor, A.J.P. English History, 1914-45 Oxford: O.U.P., 1965
- Walker, A. Restoring the Kingdom
London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1998, 1988 [1985]
- Warfield, B.B. Studies in Perfectionism, Vol. 2 New York: O.U.P., 1931
- Warrington, K. (ed.) Pentecostal Perspectives Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1998
- Weber, M. The Sociology of Religion (E.T. E. Rischhoff)
Boston: Beacon Press, 1964⁴
- Wickham, E.R. Church and People in an Industrial City
London: Lutterworth Press, 1957
- Whittaker, C. Seven Pentecostal Pioneers Basingstoke: Marshalls, 1983
- Wigglesworth, S. Ever Increasing Faith
Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1971 [1924]

- Wilkinson, A. The Church of England and the First World War
London: SCM, 1978
- Dissent or Conform: War, Peace and the English Churches,
1900-45 London: SCM, 1986
- Wilson, B. Sects and Society London: Heinemann, 1961
- Patterns of Sectarianism London: Heinemann, 1967
- Wilson, C. First with the News London: W.H. Smith, 1985
- Womersley, H. William Burton: Congo Pioneer Eastbourne: Victory Press, 1973
- Worsfield, J. The Origins of the Apostolic Church in Great Britain
Wellington, New Zealand,: Julian Literature Trust, 1991
- York, M. The Emerging Network London: Rowman & Littlefield, 1995

